

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 277

JC 910 491

AUTHOR Higginbottom, George H.
TITLE The Civic Ground of Collegiate General Education and the Community College. Working Paper Series No. 1-91.
INSTITUTION Broome Community Coll., Binghamton, NY. Inst. for Community Coll. Research.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 107p.; Originally the preface and conclusion of a Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; Civics; *Community Colleges; *Curriculum Development; Educational Objectives; Educational Responsibility; Educational Trends; *General Education; *Liberal Arts; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

These two chapters offer a rationale for the inclusion of civic education as a nexus of community college general education. The first chapter provides an introductory overview of various issues related to general education reform and the new emphasis among educators and critics on postsecondary civic or citizenship education. This chapter offers a historical overview of the purposes and content of general and liberal arts education, and its role in assuring socio-cultural unity through common learning. An argument is put forth for conceiving general education in a civic mode as a way of mediating the liberal and vocational strains of community college education. The current concern of academics and politicians with education's civic agenda is discussed in the context of the lack of college students' civic knowledge and the lack of institutional commitment to citizenship education prevalent in the 1970's and 1980's. The final chapter reviews the history of community college general/civic education from the institution's beginnings, while focusing on the three decades following the Truman-Johnson era (1950-1980). It also provides a critical discussion of the civic education commitments of selected community college general education plans connected with the curricular reforms of the 1980's. This chapter concludes with a model of community college general/civic education which incorporates a generic collegiate design, but is responsive to the unique circumstances of the two-year college. (AYC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *



The INSTITUTE for COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESEARCH

BROOME COMMUNITY COLLEGE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
P.O. BOX 1017
BINGHAMTON, N.Y. 13902
(607) 771-5000

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Romano

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE CIVIC GROUND OF COLLEGIATE GENERAL EDUCATION AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

George H. Higginbottom

Working Paper Series
No. 1 - 91

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



THE INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESEARCH

Broome Community College
P. O. Box 1017
Binghamton N. Y. 13902

November, 1991

The Institute for Community College Research was founded in 1983 to encourage research into questions related to the mission, financing, and outcomes of the community college. One of the Institute's programs for encouraging research is to offer a Dissertation Prize for graduate students. Dr. George Higginbottom, at the time a graduate student at Cornell University, is the third recipient of this prize.

What we have published in this Working Paper is the preface and the last chapter of his dissertation. It cannot rightfully be called a summary of Dr. Higginbottom's views, because it leaves out the entire historical and theoretical argument upon which the last chapter is based. Nevertheless, it does give the reader a flavor of what can be found in the dissertation. We have included the original table of contents and the entire bibliography to give the reader a better understanding of the nature of the larger work.

This dissertation was also awarded the Butterworth prize by Cornell University's Department of Education.

Richard Romano, Director

THE CIVIC GROUND OF COLLEGIATE GENERAL EDUCATION
AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Cornell University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by
George Hjelm Higginbottom

May 1991

THE CIVIC GROUND OF COLLEGIATE GENERAL EDUCATION
AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

George Hjelm Higginbottom, Ph.D.
Cornell University 1991

The revival of interest in general education curricula in recent years has been the occasion for systematic reflection upon latent tensions within American social and political culture concerning the nature of democratic citizenship. Emblematic of those tensions are the frequently conflictual impulses which characterize our liberal penchant for individuality and autonomy, on the one hand, and our democratic yearning for solidarity and community, on the other.

The American community college, an open access bridge between high school and four-year college, its diverse institutional mission giving equal weight to university parallel, occupational, and personal development and life enrichment goals, presents an even more powerful challenge to those seeking curricular common ground and a greater degree of social solidarity. It is my contention that debate over liberal-democratic citizenship and civic education can educe both a shared institutional ethos and a suitable ground for collegiate general education curricula.

This study has two principal aims. The first, a normative claim concerning the civic ground of collegiate general education, I have sought to substantiate both historically and formally: by adducing the record of and reasons governing higher education's curricular evolution in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and by justifying collegiate general/civic education in light of our self-proclaimed

intentions of reproducing and improving our liberal-democratic way of life. Second, I have attempted to describe and justify a generic model of collegiate/civic education (subsequently adapted to the community college environment) which mediates the unity/diversity tensions within our culture, and which is responsive to the most incisive philosophizing upon liberal-democratic citizenship: its moral and rational claims and grounds, and its implicit requirements, under the consent doctrine, for political participation. Specifically, I have sought the moral and communicative requisites of a strong consent, liberal-democratic citizenship in the work of John Rawls and Jurgen Habermas, preliminary to describing a suitable theory of collegiate general/civic education.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vii
Preface	viii
Chapter I Community College General/Civic Education: Problems and Perspectives	1
Chapter II The General and Civic Education Commitments of the Higher Education Curriculum: An Historical Account	40
Chapter III General Education Models and Civic Education Goals in Higher Education: An Appraisal	96
Chapter IV A Theory of Liberal-Democratic Citizenship I: Moral Personality and Civic Virtue	169
Chapter V A Theory of Liberal-Democratic Citizenship II: Communicative Competence	236
Chapter VI Collegiate/General Education: A Generic Model	335
Chapter VII General/Civic Education at the Community College: An Adaptation	413
Epilogue	479
Bibliography	482

List of Tables

Table 5.1	Types of Action	286
Table 5.2	Types of Argumentation	288
Table 5.3	Aspects of the Rationality of Action	307
Table 5.4	Pure Types of Linguistically Mediated Interaction	308
Table 6.1	A Decalogue of Democratic Civic Values	370
Table 6.2	Civic Education Models: The Views of Nine Theorists	395
Table 7.1	The Miami-Dade General Education Model	439
Table 7.2	The Los Medanos General Education Plan	446
Table 7.3	General/civic Education Goals	468
Table 7.4	Core Courses and Program Courses Which Address Civic Learning Objectives	470
Table 7.5	Other Cites of Civic Learning and Practice	476

PREFACE

Since the late 1970's, higher education has been very much occupied with curricular reform, its objective to establish programs of general education capable of introducing clarity of purpose and coherence into the collegiate course of studies.

Coherence and purpose in education are easily attained in static, backward looking societies. Where change is slow, and where traditional values and beliefs direct educational practice, the task of social and cultural reproduction presents few problems. The myths or texts which transmit the concepts and values and the very language of a culture's sense of literacy are considered authoritative both for the ends and the curricular content of education. In an open, dynamic, highly individualistic society like ours, however, the bonds of community and mutuality need deliberately to be created--and recreated--and in higher education that task has fallen mainly upon the idea and program of General Education.

General Education reformers frequently talk of "restoring" purpose and coherence as if evoking an earlier, "golden age," when the collegiate curriculum presumably rested upon unshakable foundational beliefs about knowledge, truth, and value. During America's colonial era, that sort of intellectual and curricular consensus did exist for the most part in higher education. Whether prepared to join the Puritan clergy, as in New England, or the landholding aristocracy, as in Virginia, young men were heirs to a tradition of common belief in the intellectual efficacy and moral authority of classical studies. For a time that ideal was thought to be appropriate training even for careers in commerce, but the effect of the Newtonian Revolution in

Science and the European Enlightenment which followed disrupted the unity and purpose of the colonial curriculum by introducing diversity and by derogating the authority of classical studies. Despite vigorous defenses of the classical curriculum in the "early national" period by elite liberal arts colleges like Yale and Amherst, the trend toward curricular modernization and diversification commensurate with the growth of new knowledge proved irresistible, and the notion of a common authoritative learning was undercut by the same forces undermining metaphysical certitude.

Once the authority and universality of classical studies had been breached, however, the collegiate curriculum was confronted with persuasive arguments for grounding collegiate education less upon inherited ideas of truth and value than upon personal and social utility. In the period of rapid commercial and industrial development following the Civil War, evolving state university systems increasingly yoked their institutional missions with the social and economic goals of their respective state governments, the so-called "Wisconsin Plan" of the "Progressive Era" being the most complete expression of partnership between academy and government. Further fragmenting the curriculum's former unity were professional schools and a university faculty organizing itself into disciplinary departments. The former group sought to replace liberal and general education with professional studies; the latter conceived a balanced education as the sum of disciplinary courses, and encouraged students to commit themselves early in their studies to academic concentrations.

If educational coherence no longer meant a curriculum organized around a corpus of authoritative classical texts, the ideal of a

purposive learning beyond the merely practical and utilitarian survived in the tradition of the liberal arts. Its goal, the production of cultivated gentlemen--"rounded" personalities as Matthew¹ Arnold put it--liberal arts education was⁴ purveyed mainly through the humanistic disciplines of history, philosophy, and literature. Where practical curricula aimed at preparing students to make their living, the liberal arts proposed to teach these students another, arguably practical, lesson--how to live well. "All education is by definition practical," notes Sheldon Rothblatt: "How it is practical is the operative question [whether]...broadly or narrowly useful, general² preparation for life in the world or a specific career?" The contrast between utilitarian and liberal arts education, thus, was between studies which were narrowly and broadly useful.

Even so, the humanistic disciplines--philosophy, literature, history--were less practical than the rhetorical arts of the classical tradition, the former useful for private ends--understanding and appreciating--the latter for public ends--engaging and participating in the affairs of the day. That part of the liberal arts tradition having its origins in the ancient Greek curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, and logic had a decidedly practical bent; the arts of persuasion and argument were intended to prepare Greek men for civic

¹ Matthew Arnold, "Seeing Life Clearly and Seeing it Whole," Culture and Anarchy (Cambridge University, 1960 [1869] 69).

² Sheldon Rothblatt, "General Education on the American Campus: A Historical Introduction in Brief," in Ian Westbury and Alan Purves, Eds., Cultural Literacy and the Idea of General Education (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago, 1988), p. 9.

life. David Matthews, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, comments on that connection.

The liberal arts and the civic arts are not unrelated. When we wanted a community that would embrace more than kin and exist for more than warring--that is, when the Greeks developed the concept of a civic order, a political community--we had to "invent" an education to sustain the new order...there is always a "civic self" that has to be educated. 3

Within the liberal arts, then, were the grounds of two related intellectual traditions: one aiming to make the discursive arts of democratic practice generally available, the other connected more with appraising the human condition from a distance.

Against the narrowly practical rhetoric and curricular practices of the new industrial and technological culture of the latter 19th century the liberal arts would need to devise an adaptive strategy if they were to continue to be central to higher education and integral to the civic arts. General Education's occasion had arrived; it's role was to mediate the tension's between liberal and utilitarian education. Whereas the "social Darwinist"-inspired utility movement had located educational ends with individual choice, competitive struggle, and material reward, and the liberal arts tradition had equivocated between a model which sought to reproduce the genteel sensibilities of a depoliticized classical humanism, and one which sought intellectual coherence through disciplinary reorganization, the general education curriculum was to become the curricular locus of concerns for the welfare of the collectivity.

3

David Matthews, "The Liberal Arts and the Civic Arts," Liberal Education (Winter, 1982), p. 271.

General education's claim as mediator of the liberal-utilitarian dispute lay in its dual parentage; it was comprised of both strains. It valued both skills and knowledge, and cultivated both practical and humanistic ends. Responsive to the social, economic, and cultural turmoil of the early twentieth century, and also to the growth and diversity of its student body, collegiate general education's ground came to repose in the problem of democratic citizenship. Democratic citizenship was the common bond of an increasingly heterogeneous society where customs and language divided communities, and where the social consequences of industrial and urban growth sorely tested the nation's foundational liberal-democratic principles. Deliberating upon the curricular requisites of democratic personality and practice, general education advocates reaffirmed the nation's egalitarian and participative commitments. Howsoever conceived, whether as a "great books"-type program, a liberal arts "distribution" plan, or a "functionalist" curriculum, general education reform programs in American higher education would be compelled to justify their curricular prescriptions with reference to the requirements of a society committed to equal opportunity, social mobility and participative citizenship.

The curricular expression of sentiments of socio-cultural unity thought to be attainable through a common learning, general education has been a means of clarifying higher education's social role and responsibility. Whether viewed as a corrective aimed at redressing societal ills or individualistic excesses, or a means of constraining intellectual fragmentation, or a clarion call for cultural consolidation, the rhetoric of collegiate general education characteristically

has been evocative of purpose and coherence within a particular evolving social and political milieu.

In twentieth century America general education proposed to moderate the elitist overtones of traditional liberal education, leaven the narrow functionalism and materialism of utilitarian social philosophy, and combat the social atomism bred of liberalism's individualist excesses. Through general education curricula, American colleges affirmed their beliefs in the ideal of a free, enlightened citizenry.

Collegiate general education reform has also been an animated discourse on education's philosophical grounds; questions concerning education's purposes, and the nature and grounds of knowledge, human learning, and pedagogy are its stock-in-trade. Where all philosophies of education must ultimately be justified in terms of democratic social aspirations, as in America, it is especially so of general education. That social philosophies of education in America must profess democratic goals, however, is no guarantee of social or political consensus. Disagreements arise over the means judged to be most efficacious respecting the ends of a democratic society, but also over the ends themselves.

The quintessential plan of general education, formulated between the two world wars, blended, according to author, Gary Miller, Deweyan instrumentalism with a "naturalized humanism" on behalf of a progressive social agenda. That general education, he averred, was aimed at

Set[ting] aside the universalist world view of the classical curriculum and of traditional humanists for a more humanistic goal: the development, within

individual students, of social values and predispositions to social action that, taken together and applied to daily life, would comprise a new American culture. 4

This paradigm of general education unapologetically embraced civism and social reform. It was a product of the social and political ideals of the Progressive movement in union with the native American philosophy of Pragmatism developed by Pierce and James, and given a public twist and a pedagogical mission by John Dewey.

Civic, or citizenship, education at its best was neither a program of narrow values socialization, nor training in the politics of self-interest; rather, it was a plan for democratic education rooted in broadly participative public discourse. It included beliefs about the inseparability of democratic governance and education, the continuity of educational means and ends and of human experience, the social and intellectual utility of a problems-oriented curriculum, and moral commitments to the welfare and improvement of the society.

The progressive resolution of that classic tension in American life between individualism and social responsibility--at least
5
Dewey's--was founded upon the utter mutual dependency of democracy and individual growth. The Deweyan justification of individualism (for democracy) and democracy (for individualism) served to ground public education in democratic citizenship, but the precise nature and

4
Gary Miller, The Meaning of General Education: The Emergence of a Paradigm. (New York: Columbia University, 1988), p. 43.

5
John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: MacMillan, 1916).

curricular requisites of both individualism and democracy remained ever problematical.

Many of the tensions inhering in postsecondary education-- between liberal and utilitarian philosophies, between the interests of the individual and the group, and between general and specialized studies-- exert powerful influences in community colleges. Democracy's college," so it has been called, presents an interesting study of the prospects of collegiate general/civic education. In virtue of its programmatic diversity and technical-vocational "careerism," the aims of general education inevitably collide with these narrower, vocational interests. On the other hand, practical concerns for the quality of democratic citizenship are likely to win broad approval at the community college. Properly understood, the goal of effective citizenship is a compelling ground for general education at the community college.

The virtue of general education conceived in the civic mode lies in its capacity to mediate the liberal and vocational strains of community college education. By reason both of its community roots and commitments to open access and equal opportunity, the community college is uniquely positioned to appreciate how democratic citizenship education might plausibly become the locus both of curricular coherence and a clearer sense of institutional purpose. But much needs to be overcome if that aspiration is to become reality. Democratic citizenship, its participative aspirations and competencies and its desirable characteristics, need to be clearly specified and incorporated into the postsecondary curriculum.

Lamenting the sorry state of collegiate civic knowledge and commitment in the 1970's and '80's, curriculum theorists Arthur Levine and David Haselkorn argued that "today's young people [were] in need of education that teaches five things: knowledge about the world in which they live; the skills to function in that world and to change it for the better; efficacy as individuals and as citizens; responsibility to others and for the future; and hope about the potential of

⁶
tomorrow." The spate of reports chronicling the failures of America's secondary and postsecondary education, they observed, have paid scant attention to the crying need for citizenship education to combat the "rising tide of self-concern and a growing rejection of the common
⁷
civic agenda," which reflect the attitudes of the nation's young.

Recently, however, scholarly and legislative attention to education's civic agenda has grown apace, and the bandwagon of national service and volunteerism has become crowded with both academics and politicians. Educators and critics have increasingly urged colleges to take up the citizenship agenda, and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the official voice of America's two-year institutions, recently added civic education to its short list of promotional priorities. It has been restored to respectability as a goal of collegiate education, but there remain the challenges of conceiving and justifying a theory of democratic

⁶
Arthur Levine and David Haselkorn, "Liberal Education's Civic Agenda," Liberal Education (March, 1985), p. 3.

⁷
Ibid., p. 4.

citizenship to which most educators would assent, and of describing a theory of collegiate civic education which could achieve what Levine and Haselkorn propose, while assuming a curricular form which most faculty and administrators would support.

Above all, the attributes of effective democratic citizenship need clearly to be delineated and justified if the curricular and instructional programs responsible for educating civic skills and dispositions are to be well conceived and successful. In a liberal-democratic state one must begin with the notion of "consent." Implicit in this seminal democratic concept, "consent of the governed," are the associated moral, rational, dispositional, informational, communicative, and performative requirements of effective participation. A major part of this study, therefore, is taken with the specification and justification of the personal and social attributes of democratic citizenship deriving from liberal-democratic theory.

The study attempts to integrate genetic and analytic accounts of general/civic education. In Chapter One I compare a contemporary conception of community college general education framed by the Educational Testing Service with Lamar Johnson's 1952 study of general education in California's community colleges. The contemporary model is more skills-oriented, its learning aims less socially-oriented than

⁸
Community College Goals Inventory. (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1981).

⁹
B. Lamar Johnson, General Education in Action: A Report of the California Study of General Education in the Junior Colleges (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952).

Johnson's functionalist plan. While the Johnson formulation accorded democratic citizenship top priority, the CCGI model pays scant attention to it. Why that is so--its significance--inaugurates a historical inquiry into community college general education beginning with the principal authorizing document of the community college expansion following World War II. The Truman Commission Report,¹⁰ Higher Education for Democracy, reveals prevailing attitudes toward the community college role in higher education and toward civic education. From the juxtaposition of these two documents emerges a range of perplexing questions concerning educational aims and their historical and ideological interdependencies, in particular, changing conceptions of the curricular importance, constitutive features, and goals of citizenship education.

Chapter two is an account of general education's historical evolution. Originating in the mid-nineteenth century, general education's importance grew as public education became available to the masses, as the population became increasingly diverse, and as the complexity of modern life disrupted traditional folkways and institutions. Schools were called upon to play mediating roles between the society's real diversity and its philosophical commitments to individualism, on the one hand, and the need for social bonding, the principle of unity, on the other. Emerging from between the two World Wars, the "progressive" formulations of collegiate general education

10

The President's Commission for Higher Education, Higher Education for Democracy (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947).

attempted (among other things) to reconcile individual with social "needs" through the agency of democratic citizenship.

Progressive theory and practice provides the occasion to discuss the purposes and methods of American education, and in particular, the tensions and disagreements which inhabit its central commitments: namely, present-mindedness, instrumentalism and functionalism, pragmatism, and experientialism. All of these features, claims Gary Miller, are at the heart of genuine general education curricula, because general education is the invention of "progressive" educators.

Finally, the Harvard "Redbook" proposal for general education reform provides the occasion to ruminate further on the unity-diversity theme, the socio-political and curricular legacy of liberal-democracy, and to underscore the salience of civic education as mediating concept.

The evolutionary aspect of general/civic education having been reviewed, the next three chapters are primarily analytical. In Chapter Three I appraise various schemes of general education in terms of their aims, intellectual foundations, and pedagogies, and then assess the implications of each formulation for democratic citizenship and civic education.

Chapter Four is an inquiry into the philosophical grounds of liberal-democratic theory, with implications for citizenship and civic education. Appraising the oppositional conceptions of social rationality and ethics espoused by liberals and communitarians, and finding value in both perspectives, I seek grounds for accommodation. John Rawls' contractarian theory of right (justice) is contrasted with various communitarian theories which value social solidarity highly.

I conclude that the accommodation of liberal and communitarian views cannot be at the expense of liberalism's core principles, in particular, neutrality respecting theories of the good life and basic rights. There remain important areas of democratic theory and practice, however--participation, moral personality, civic virtue--where agreement is possible. All of these liberal-democratic concepts and practices are grist for collegiate general/civic education curricula.

Chapter Five addresses a second important feature of democratic citizenship deriving from the consent doctrine: communicative competence as a requisite of effective participation. "Naive" and "critical" approaches to political conversation are juxtaposed in the "civic forum" and in the dynamics of "communicative action." Various "liberal" notions of political talk and participation, subsequently, I judge to be inadequate, but remediable through the application of critical theoretical and "strong democratic" notions of argumentative speech and participation, respectively.

Liberal-democratic citizenship's core principles having been defended against views critical of them, and accommodations with aspects of communitarian civism having been proposed, Chapter Six formulates a full theory of citizenship and a corresponding generic theory of collegiate civic education from the views of the principal philosophers and theorists discussed in previous chapters with special emphasis on Dewey, Rawls, and Jurgen Habermas.

Lastly, in Chapter Seven, the generic model of collegiate civic education is adapted to the community college environment. Relevant considerations include the institution's history and features of its

political culture and postsecondary mission. Several representative general education models are examined in light both of institutional constraints on general education and civic aims.

Among postsecondary educational institutions the community college is most susceptible to attacks from critics of liberalism's residual utilitarianism: its penchant for economic and technocratic reasoning which privileges private over public interest, favors expert decision-making and control, reduces moral questions to procedures and cost-benefit calculations, and derogates political and participative aspects of democratic citizenship. These anti-democratic aspects of utilitarian liberalism, allegedly, have come home to roost in the community college. In defending both liberalism and the community college against such charges I make two related claims: first, that such features as are presumed by liberalism's critics to be integral aspects of it plainly are not, and second, that a collegiate civic education based upon critical rationality, communicative competence, moral perspective, and active participation can simultaneously redeem a sense of citizenship which incorporates the fundamental principles of liberal-democratic philosophy and political theory and reclaim a vital, educative role for community college general education.

CHAPTER VII - GENERAL/CIVIC EDUCATION IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

There is an urgent need to provide a core experience of common learning [and] that all students be able to put their lives in historical and social perspective and be prepared to meet their social and civic obligations.

The Commission on the Future of
Community Colleges

General Education is for the creation of a
free citizenry.

Arthur Cohen

INTRODUCTION

The design for collegiate civic education developed in Chapter six is a generic model. It is meant to suit the entire postsecondary educational stratum, but it will need to be fine tuned to the unique resonances of its diverse collegiate environments. Junior colleges, public community colleges, elite liberal arts colleges, state colleges, and large research universities, all present somewhat different problems and opportunities. The civic education model must be adaptable. That does not mean, however, that its three features can be grossly altered or that others can be substituted for them. It does mean that by virtue of differences in institutional culture, demography, and resources, some aspects of collegiate civic education will receive greater attention than others. Here the task is to determine in what ways the generic model needs to be modified to fit the public community college ambience.

This chapter is divided into three parts. First is an historical overview of community college general/civic education from the institution's beginnings, but focusing upon the three decades following the Truman-Johnson era, roughly 1950-1980. Second is a

critical discussion of the civic education commitments of selected community college general education plans connected with the curricular reforms of the eighties. Last is a model of community college general/civic education which incorporates the various features of the generic collegiate design, but which is responsive to the unique circumstances of the "two-year college." If I have been at all successful, the claim concerning the civic nexus of community college general education which has inspired this inquiry will have been persuasively demonstrated on both normative and empirical grounds.

THE GENERAL/CIVIC EDUCATION MISSION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 1947-80

Scholarly articles on community college curriculum in the early years of the movement are few, and fewer still are contributions from junior college practitioners. However, compelling arguments on behalf of the civic function of community college general education are found in the literature as early as 1915, when A. A. Gray of the University of California, writing in The School Review, endorsed as a central goal "preparation for citizenship and not for the higher educational institutions."¹ Gray was insisting upon the unique role of the two-year college in educating both for the workplace and the community. Like many educators of his era, Gray adopted the rhetoric and aims of social efficiency, and saw the two-year college complementing the social and economic roles of high school and college.

¹

A. A. Gray, "The Junior College in California," The School Review, 1915, pp. 465-73.

In 1925, Leonard Koos, surveyed the literature on the "junior" college and, like Gray, found strong reasons to support a view of its uniqueness and special mission in post-secondary education, among which were citizenship education and community service. Then, in 1944, James Reynolds attempted the first comprehensive assessment of general education in two-year colleges, finding that most had poorly conceived programs.³ But the most powerful catalyst of community college general education, as we have seen, were the Truman Commission in 1947, and Lamar Johnson's California Study in 1951 and 1952. The Truman Commission had enthusiastically endorsed a general education in which democratic citizenship concerns were paramount. And both Johnson and the Harvard "Redbook" authors gave earnest attention to the cultivation of civic skills and commitments.

In a 1960 retrospective on the California study by its author, Lamar Johnson reaffirmed his earlier instrumental definition of general education as "The knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by an individual to be effective as a person, a family member, a worker, and a citizen."⁴ His preference was for a curriculum organized by problems and case studies which cut across disciplines and departments

and which required knowledge integration. He favored adapting introductory discipline courses for the non-specialist. "Leading college faculty members to an awareness of the nonspecialist student," he observed, "was one of the most significant contributions which the general education movement has made to American education."⁵ Johnson remained true to his progressive roots, continuing to espouse what Cross regarded as "functionalist" views of learning.⁶ In this article, however, Johnson distinguished clearly between needs of students and the needs of society, proposing to balance the two in his general education model, and in virtue of that, seemed to be advocating something more interesting than life-adjustment education.

Cross ascribes general education's failure between 1950 and 1980 to having been squeezed between vocational/occupational education and the transfer function: the former subordinate to business and the latter to four-year colleges and universities. It is a view shared by the chroniclers of the community college movement--Leland Medsker, James Thornton, James Hammons, and Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer. Hammons, for example, captured general education's failure in the community college poignantly in the title of his curricular review, "General Education: A Missed Opportunity Returns."⁷ Hammons blamed the Sputnik "crisis" for diverting the 1940's and '50's momentum be-

⁵
Ibid., p. 291.

⁶
Cross, "Thirty Years Have Passed," Op. Cit., p. 18.

⁷
James D. Hammons in Arthur Cohen ed., General Education New Directions in Community Colleges #25 (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1979).

hind general education. Scientific studies and rigid disciplinarity together with vocationalism subsequently won the day. Then, in the two decades between 1960 and 1980, community colleges were so busy trying to consolidate their positions in postsecondary education following the era of rapid growth, that they had little energy left⁸ for curricular revision. A flood of young faculty fresh from graduate schools brought with them a subject and lecture centered pedagogy and strong attachments to academic disciplines, to departmentalism, and to the major-dominated curriculum of the university. General Education had fallen on hard times.

Hammons and Ward's 1978 survey of academic deans of two-year⁹ colleges uncovered a wide discrepancy between beliefs and institutional practices. While the deans preferred topical, interdisciplinary general education courses, the distribution system on most campuses featured introductory courses in the disciplines-- psychology, sociology, history, literature. Hammons and Ward found that the academic culture of two year campuses, very much as in four-year colleges, but with an additional (and powerful) occupational education faculty faction, militated against general education curriculum development. Balancing that dismal prognosis, however, was Hammons' list of factors favoring general education: namely its

⁸

Diversions included campus construction, collective bargaining, open door policy implementations, community arrangements, and occupational education pressures.

⁹

J. O. Hammons and S. A. Ward, "General Education in The Community College: Past, Present, Future," unpublished manuscript, School of Education, University of Arkansas, 1978.

current visibility; evidence of reduced articulation problems with transfer institutions; its potential as a factor in student recruitment; its cost efficiency; the failure of the present distribution system to impart a common learning; its acknowledged utility to students in terminal occupational programs; its implications for the widely agreed upon need for faculty and curricular revitalization; and the preferences of instructional deans.¹⁰

Hammons drew additional support for his negative appraisal of general education's progress from earlier surveys and studies of community college curricular practices: by Leland Medsker in 1960,¹¹ and by James W. Thornton in 1966. Surveying two hundred and forty-three two-year colleges, Medsker found them to be lacking in clarity of purpose; they were, he felt, trying too hard to be all things to all people. Consequently, they were not particularly thoughtful about the general education curriculum. Still, he believed that "no one should be too quick to criticize [them] for not having done more. The

10

J. O. Hammons, "General Education: A Missed Opportunity Returns," Op. Cit., pp. 70-71. Along with Ernest Boyer and Abraham Kaplan, Education for Survival, Op. Cit., Hammons believed the general education stakes to be very large indeed. Several of his rationales for a revitalized general education subsequently became central to the discourse on collegiate curricular reform. See especially Boyer and Levine, Op. Cit.

11

Leland L. Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), and James W. Thornton Jr., The Community Junior College (New York: Wiley, 1966).

demands of vocational education made severe inroads on the time
12
available for general education.

Thornton's comprehensive volume on the community college devoted a full chapter to general education. His Deweyan attachments were clearly evident in his definition of general education as

a program of education specifically designed to afford young people more effective preparation for the responsibilities they share in common as citizens in a free society and for wholesome and creative participation in a wide range of life activities. It attempts to clarify the focal problems of our times and to develop the intellectual skills and moral habits to cope with them. 13

What community college students had in common, he averred, "adult students and occupational students and high-risk students alike [were]
14
the focal problems of our times," and to deal with these effectively general education was a necessity. General education was justified, in short, in civic terms: as the skills, knowledge, intellectual acuity, and moral dispositions of participatory democratic citizenship. And in that connection "new organizations of instruction, emphasizing the utility of the subject matter to the student rather
15
than the totality of the disciplinary field," were required.

12
Medsker, Ibid., p. 63, also found 46% of those institutions sampled requiring 6 credits in civic education, but "unimaginatively" presented as U. S. History or Government survey courses.

13
Thornton, Op. Cit., p. 65.

14
Ibid., p. 66. Thornton summarized p. 203, "Common citizenship and common humanity beget common educational needs."

15
Ibid., p. 66.

Finding that none of the fifty-eight junior college catalogs which he surveyed "exhibited a coherent, comprehensive, well-planned, and carefully evaluated curriculum to lead its students toward the twelve goals of general education," Thornton proposed two solutions:¹⁶ a total curricular involvement with the goals such that all faculty actively purveyed them, and a total--elementary, secondary, collegiate¹⁷--articulation of general education goals. His plan would provide capstone courses totalling 20-21 credits in four areas which students had been instructed in from grade school: communication, American civilization, the physical world, and human behavior. The American civilization sequence was designed to produce competent citizens who were acquainted with their cultural heritage, who thought critically, refined their moral views, and participated in civic affairs.

Thornton's work is important because of his efforts to extend Johnson's project in community college general education and because of his keen sense of the structure of school-to-college curriculum, and especially respecting the thesis of my study, because of his democratic citizenship rationale for a curriculum of common learning. The significance of that rationale, he believed, lay in its capacity to bridge the dualistic--transfer/occupational--mission of

¹⁶

Ibid., p. 214. The reference was to the twelve general education goals of Johnson's California Study, General Education in Action, Op. Cit.

¹⁷

That theme was foreshadowed earlier by Alfred W. Wall, "What About Terminal General Education in the Junior College?" Junior College Journal, No. 33, Sept., 1962, pp. 20-24. Wall argued that "Twelve years is proving to be inadequate preparation for accepting one's civic, economic, social, and personal responsibilities."

the community college by locating the justification for common learning (a core curriculum) in shared concerns, and goals. The appeal of general/civic education to community college faculty lies in its practical utility. It has appeal both to faculty preparing students for careers in occupational and technical fields whose approach to the curriculum typically is technical and practical, and also to liberal arts faculty who sense the importance of connecting abstract and theoretical studies to an overarching purpose. Such agreements as may exist concerning aims, however, stop far short of specifying meanings and means, and it is there that disagreements arise--between technical and liberal arts faculty and among individuals within each group.

So the task at hand is not simply to justify a civic ground for community college general education, but also to describe and justify a model of civic education with particular features which are sensitive to the culture and mission of the community college. Arthur M. Cohen, UCLA Professor, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, and "dean" of community college scholars, has contributed mightily to those endeavors. In a long list of scholarly articles and books, many co-authored with his wife, Florence Brawer, Cohen has chronicled the failings of community college general education curricula, exhorted community college personnel to do

18

The reference to core curriculum here encompasses both a core group of required courses and a core curriculum viewed as "an intentionally structured series of learning outcomes." See Mauritz Johnson, Intentionality in Education: A Conceptual Model of Curricular and Instructional Planning and Evaluation. (Albany, New York: Center for Curriculum Research and Service, 1977)

better, and proposed models and plans related thereto. His expectation for general education as constituting "the freedom of the informed citizen"¹⁹ in a democratic state recapitulates a common theme of the general education curriculum since its inception, and most powerfully evoked in the Truman Commission Report.

If institutions in the sixties and seventies were coping with rapid growth and with problems of identity and mission, concerns for the civic aspirations of community college general education, though faint and infrequent, persisted, and by the late seventies, in the contributions of Cohen and others, they were greatly amplified. About the time Harvard College was bringing forth its new general education model in 1978, the dormant roots of curricular reform were also stirring on community college campuses. In Florida, in response both to fiscal and demographic pressures, the state educational system was being overhauled. Concerns for academic standards and institutional effectiveness would result in an exemplary general education model at the state's largest two-year institution, Miami-Dade Community College. And in the same year Cohen presented a major paper at Montgomery College's (Maryland) "Forum on The Future, Purposes, Content, and Formats for The General Education of Community College Students."²⁰

19

Arthur M. Cohen and Florence Brawer, The American Community College (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1984), p. 328.

20

Arthur M. Cohen, "The Case for General Education in Community Colleges," unpublished paper, May 22, 1978.

In his address Cohen foreshadowed some of the themes which he would enunciate even more compellingly through the 1980's. Through the cafeteria-style curriculum and consumer model of education, educators had abdicated their responsibilities to students and society such that the college curriculum "was in jeopardy of disintegrating²¹ into a set of haphazard events." General education had much to overcome; its "unstable history" included excessive disciplinarity, association with terminal education, and a life/vocational-adjustment bias. What community colleges ought to strive for in general education curricula, Cohen contended, should meet objective criteria. Content and learning would need to be verifiably educative, socially²² utilitarian, and not readily available elsewhere. Favoring, as had Dewey, an experiential, problems--oriented, social action motivated curricular plan, Cohen grounded his general education rationale in his concern for effective democratic citizenship, captured most forcefully in his summative declaration that "General education is for the²³ creation of a free citizenry."

As interesting as the many and diverse papers presented at the conference, was the symbolic significance of the event itself, for it served to merge the community college general education movement with reform efforts nationally. General education reform had received powerful intellectual and policy-implicated encouragement from

²¹
Ibid., p. 1

²²
Ibid., p. 22.

²³
Ibid., p. 28

Carnegie Foundation President, Ernest Boyer, and his co-authors
24
Abraham Kaplan and Arthur Levine. The forces of cultural consolidation, recalling Robert Wiebe's sense of general education's occasion, were resurgent--or were they? What was immediately apparent was that diverse institutions with equally diverse missions, traditions, and political cultures opted for different conceptions of general education, and it was not at all clear that the impelling motivations sprang from the latent sentiments of what Butts referred to as "unum," or from a recrudescence of civic-oriented "habits of the heart."

Whereas the Bok-Rosovsky plan at Harvard featured intellectual inquiry in conjunction with the methodologies of communities of academic inquirers, the core curriculum makers at Miami-Dade Community College paid rather more attention to the terms and conditions of
25
survival in an individualist mode. And numerous variants of these

24

See Boyer and Kaplan, Education for Survival, and Boyer and Levine, A Quest for Common Learning, Op. Cit. The former volume adopted a singularly pragmatic rationale for general education; the latter was more balanced philosophically in seeking to identify the latent sources of commonality and community in, for example, shared language and values.

25

Neither of the models addressed the civic republican sentiments nor the communitarian agendas, found in Sullivan, Barber, or Pratte. See Jeffrey D. Lukenbill and Robert H. McCabe, General Education in a Changing Society (Miami-Dade Community College, 1978), and The Harvard Core, Op. Cit. Differences among various institutional models were chronicled by author/editor, Jerry Gaff in the American Association of College's "General Education Models (GEM)" project between 1979 and 1984. That project provided resources and encouragement for curriculum reformers in a range of postsecondary institutions nationwide.

types were soon to emerge. Despite the great variety among curricular plans, virtually all sought in some way to connect learning objectives with the challenges of democratic citizenship, whether conceived as instilling patriotism, teaching or developing decisionmaking, inquiry, critical thinking, or discourse skills, transmitting knowledge of governmental and political systems, training in techniques of public policy analysis, engendering a moral point of view, or orienting to
26
and arranging for community service.

Being something of a populist institution the community college was disposed, by virtue of its mission, student body, and egalitarian ethos, to regard democratic citizenship in participatory terms. Thus Edmund Gleazer, President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), in 1968, had marked out for the institution a politically enabling role in community development. "By design," he argued, "the college can develop the leadership capacity of local citizens [by] developing techniques of argumentation and delibera-
27
tion." Gleazer urged community college personnel to look more closely to secondary than to higher education for exemplars of general educational aims and institutional ideals. High on his list were community service, community problem-solving, and education for

26

Each of these emphases were present among general education curricular reform plans, and examples can be found among those profiled in Jerry Gaff's GEM Newsletter.

27

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "The Community College Mission in an Age of Social Revolution," in William K. Ogilvie and Max R. Raines, eds., Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings, (New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1971), p. 398.

28
"responsibilities of citizenship, family, and occupation." Former
president of Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, Charles E.
Chapman, also placed citizenship at the core of general education
learning declaring that "students...should gain not only occupational
skills but also certain backgrounds in those areas of knowledge that
29
will assist them to become more effective citizens." And William
O'Brien, Academic Dean at Kishwaukee College, concerned lest technical
educators in league with business and industry leaders be inclined to
ignore the latent aspirations of their students to become part of a
"more intelligent electorate, a more discriminating public, a more
humane citizenry," argued passionately that "the graduate of the
technical curriculum is not to be considered merely a craftsman or
skilled technician [but also] a citizen, a voter of some
30
perception..."

If community college scholars and practitioners in the 1960's
argued persuasively for more coherent and effective general education
curricula, the social and military preoccupations of the era directed
the energies of reform elsewhere. Access and equity were issues of
first priority; curriculum reform ranked below hiring, facilities
development, and a host of other growth-driven activities. The post-

28
Ibid., p. 401.

29
Charles E. Chapman, "Aligning Priorities in Junior and
Community Colleges," in American Association for Higher Education,
Current Issues in Higher Education, May 1965, pp. 167-70.

30
William O'Brien, "General Education for Technical Students,"
in Ogilvie and Raines, Op. Cit., pp. 293-98.

Vietnam era, being far more propitious for cultural introspection and goal readjustment, general education advocates of the 1970's and 80's were buoyed in their efforts by a more hospitable environment, and especially by a pervasive belief among thoughtful scholars, statesmen, and educators that something important was missing from American higher education: something which spoke to cultural commonalities, integrative visions of public life, to purpose and to meaning. The time had come, apparently, to balance narrow self-interest and the "curricular consumerism" which it engendered (in Cohen's judgment it had reduced the college curriculum to a "set of haphazard events"), with concerns for cultural coherence and social cohesion.

The community college literature of the late seventies was somewhat more sophisticated than that of the forties, fifties, and sixties, and the authors of general education critiques and proposals were more mindful than their forebears of the need for elaborate justification of normative claims in an era of pervasive skepticism. Algo and Jean Henderson, like Cohen, presenters at the Montgomery College Conference, argued a Deweyan conception of general education curriculum and pedagogy. "What are the community colleges doing to help students deal with social, political, nuclear, and environmental issues...and to become good citizens?" they asked rhetorically, positioning the general education curriculum in a civic, problem-solving ambience. And further, ascribing to the Truman Commission

31

Algo D. and Jean G. Henderson, "Revitalizing General Education in the Community College," unpublished paper presented to the Forum on Future Purposes, Content, and Formats for the General Education of Community College Students at Montgomery College, May 22, 1978, pp. 3-4.

Report the impetus for community college general education in an essentially civic mode, the Hendersons contended that the complexity of social and political issues which confront citizens today "demand a a higher degree of knowledge than can be given in the elementary and secondary schools...and at a higher level of maturity."³²

The Hendersons also attempted clearly to distinguish "general" from "liberal" education. From a liberal education ideal which was somewhat class-based and intended to serve the ends of personal freedom, enlightenment, and cultural refinement, to a more modern general education comprising a "core of knowledge that citizens in a democracy needed,"³³ the ends of collegiate education had changed with the times.³⁴ General education was to be functional with respect to the problems and challenges of living in a democratic society, as against the more passive, disengaged ideal of liberal education as accumulating cultural capital and the habits of the contemplative life. In the former mode lived experiences, including those of students, were regarded as relevant both to school-based learning and to social action.

32

Loc. Cit.

33

Ibid., p. 13. The authors regard both Harvard efforts at general education reform (1945 and 1978) as concerned mainly with the well-educated man. I believe to the contrary that the "Redbook" had profound social and democratic interests.

34

The authors clearly distinguish this functionalist theme from the "life-adjustment" version which Cross found in the Johnson model, and against which many contemporary critics of general education inveigh.

Civic-directed, problem-oriented, experiential, general education was, on the Henderson's account, just the thing for the two-year college whose roots and identity were in the local community. "Democracy's colleges" were so named not only because they were open access institutions, but also because, both by inclination and mission, they were intimately concerned with improving democratic praxis in their communities. In virtue of their community location and commitments community colleges could and ought to promote active student participation in public affairs, and consonant with Dewey's philosophy of experience and the public problems origin of exemplary democratic practice, that mode of civic education was held to be pedagogically sound as well.

Having identified the specific learning goals of community college general education as clear and accurate thinking, development of social consciousness, acquisition of communication skills, the ability to relate knowledge to living, personal growth, and successful interpersonal relations, and familiarity with conflicting values issues in light of our social heterogeneity, the Hendersons proposed that the whole curriculum as well as the campus environment assume responsibility for their attainment. Finally, citing the uniqueness of the community college, the Hendersons concluded that among all the institutions of higher education, "...the community colleges have the best opportunity to raise the general level of expectations, cultural understanding, and values of all of the people."

35

Ibid., p. 41.

William Moore's presentation at the Montgomery Forum emphasized themes similar to ones taken up by the Hendersons: the distinctions between liberal and general education and the latter's civic, egalitarian, problem-solving, learner-centered, and essentially civic concerns. Moore was particularly persuasive in insisting upon the importance of general education to vocational students, citing the common problems and responsibilities which they share with fellow students in transfer curricula as prospective citizens of a democratic society. His rationale had both idealistic (the dignity of participation in the affairs which impact one's life) and practical (the perverse "participation and decisions of uninformed persons")³⁶ considerations.

37

In a thoughtful paper presented in 1979 to a community college conference Darrel Clowes, Education professor at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and his two co-authors, Jeffrey Lukenbill of Miami-Dade Community College and Ruth Shaw of Cedar Valley College, part of the multi-campus Dallas County Community College District, proposed a

36

William Moore Jr., "The Role of General Education in the Community College," unpublished paper presented at The Forum on Future Purposes, Contents, and Formats for the General Education of Community College Students, Montgomery College, May 22, 1987.

37

Darrel A. Clowes, Jeffrey D. Lukenbill, Ruth G. Shaw, "General Education in the Community College: A Search for Purpose," unpublished paper presented at the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Chicago, Ill., April 29-May 2, 1979.

method of "telic" general education curricular reform. Citing a "dilemma of purpose" the authors proposed to clarify institutional aims as a means of engaging campus personnel in meaningful discussion of education's ends. Implicit was the notion that such activity would result not only in an improved curriculum and instruction, but also in clearer differentiation of the community college mission vis-a-vis the high school and the four-year college and university.

The models of "telic" reform to which the authors referred are ones reviewed previously in this study: Meiklejohn's at Wisconsin, Hutchins's at Chicago, Columbia's interdisciplinary course sequences, and Buchanan's at St. Johns. Those efforts were exemplary for many reasons, but of greatest instructive utility to the community college general education movement, were their dogged attempts to identify, agree upon, and consciously structure curriculum and instruction consonant with well-justified conceptions of education's purposes. The best contemporary community college models have been similarly motivated.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GENERAL EDUCATION MODELS

Among the community college models allegedly emulating the "telic" ideal and method in curricular reform are Miami-Dade in Florida, Los Medanos in California, and Cedar Valley of Dallas, Texas. Characteristically, planners at these institutions seek to

The notion of "telic" reform, recall, was thematized in Gerald Grant and David Reisman, The Perpetual Dream, Op. Cit., and discussed both by Butts and Pratte. Newmann's and Robinson's insistence upon clear rationale-building in curriculum development evokes a similar conviction.

balance their aspirations for student learning with the demographic realities of their communities: such factors as linguistic and cultural diversity; schedules, attendance patterns, occupational, age, and gender characteristics of students; fiscal resources; and student aspirations respecting degree, technical training, or personal enrichment goals. A range of constraining considerations initially served to keep the goals of general education learning realistic. Curriculum reform, thus, would not commence with "liberal" education's traditional recourse to lofty projections of the idealized attributes of the well-educated man, or even of the virtuous life. Rather, general education reform would be grounded in the real world inhabited by real people: citizens with private dreams and goals, but also drawn (or thrown) together in diverse social configurations--precincts, unions, school districts, parishes, ethnic and voluntary associations, advocacy and interest groups, and lobbies--which energize the larger community, but which also generate problems and conflicts. Assisting in the resolution of such problems the college would take to be an integral part of its general/civic education agenda.

Cedar Valley: Of the three, the Cedar Valley program took the strongest, most straightforward commitment to civic goals. Observing that "throughout its evolution, general education has included preparation for citizenship as a central function, but that only recently have community colleges begun to focus clearly upon this aspect of general education as an imperative for curricular reform,"³⁹ Cedar Valley set out consciously to reorient its vision.

In 1977, the Dallas Community College District, of which Cedar Valley is part, inaugurated a study of general education which would result in a "skills for living" curricular design. "Skills for living" came to be defined as competencies in three functional areas of daily life: "relationships," "economic, social, and political roles," and "orientations."

General education learning outcomes--skills and competencies--were to be taken up in a range of courses and curricula, both transfer and occupational. Adoption of the life skills theme, ostensibly an instantiation of the Grant-Reisman model of "telic" reform, provided the occasion at Cedar Valley for general education goals to permeate both curriculum and extracurriculum and infiltrate the consciousness of faculty, students, and administrators.

Cedar Valley planners drew considerable inspiration for their curriculum revision from the Harvard "Redbook" authors, particularly their sense of the importance of democratic citizenship. However, it is likely that the "Redbook" authors would have found in the "life skills" approach adopted by Cedar Valley discomfiting resonances with the "life adjustment" movement which had come in the 1930's to dominate "progressive" education. Cedar Valley's conception of general

40

"Relationships" encompassed personal growth and development, interpersonal relations, and relations with the external natural and social environment. Emphasis in the social, economic, and political realms was to be upon successful adjustment. And "orientations" referred mainly to acquisition of perspective.

41

Ibid., p. 16. Skills for living were defined as "Those skills that enable individuals to evaluate and adjust to every day personal and social situations in ways beneficial to the individual and/or society."

education was not, strictly speaking, a life adjustment model, inasmuch as it counted evaluation (and presumably the critical faculties and dispositions implicit in judgment) as important as adjustment.

Curricular reform in education is responsive to stimuli from numerous and diverse sources: from the society, from the academic disciplines, from changing conceptions of knowledge, from human needs and goals, and from theories of individual growth and development. The stimuli which impelled general education reform in the 1980's were felt at all levels of higher education and in all parts of the country. Concerns which a revitalized general education were to address derived from widely perceived deficiencies in student cognitive, communicative, and quantitative skills, and in their moral sensibilities, as well as from societal needs relating to economic vitality, national security and social cohesion. More mundane issues which a more clearly rationalized general education were to respond to included two-year/four-year transferability within statewide educational systems and growing public concerns over educational quality and fiscal accountability.

Community college general education reform programs were driven by multiple sources of concern and influence, namely: their shared mission within post-secondary education; their particular missions within state education apparatuses, including their community obligations; and their frequently ambivalent intellectual connections with the concerns of the higher education professoriate. Thus, while community colleges experienced many of the same problems which induced malaise throughout higher education, their own unique goals and

experiences would ensure that curricular reform--its processes and products--would differ somewhat from other post-secondary institutions, and that even within their own educational stratum, there would be a good deal of variety.

Catalysts of the general education revival in the community college in addition to Cedar Valley were the Miami-Dade (Florida) plan prepared in 1978, and the audacious and innovative program from Los Medanos (California) Community College in 1976. The Miami-Dade plan gave broad scope to personal development and social and economic adjustment, and its frame of reference was principally local, while the Los Medanos plan was equally responsive to national and global concerns: more occupied, that is, with issues of social and political reform than personal or life adjustment. Neither plan, however, was one-dimensional; each incorporated aspects of a full general education agenda. The Miami-Dade plan had a global reach and the Los Medanos model a community commitment. Both plans were sensitively drawn and reflected thoughtful appraisal of all relevant aspects of institutional missions and goals, including the community college's post-secondary niche, its student characteristics and aspirations, and its congeries of local, national, and global problems.

Miami-Dade: Reflecting the concerns of its Dade County and State of Florida government sponsors, Miami-Dade's general education planners confronted a challenge and a reality slightly different from Los Medanos. Counterposing for the sake of conceptual clarity the goals of "survival" vs. "enrichment," the Miami-Dade planners opted for a blending of viewpoints. "The general education program," they argued,

"attempts to provide students with a means for integrating theoretical knowledge and content which has 'enrichment' value with 'survival' or 'coping' skills that will improve the student's ability to function both in their formal educational pursuits and in other aspects of their personal lives." ⁴² With a largely urban, heavily non-native student population it was inevitable that Miami-Dade would need to give considerable scope to survival aims and to emphasize skills development and socio-economic integration.

The incredible growth of the Miami-Dade system--from 1,338 ⁴³ students in 1960 to 28,000 in 1970 to 42,000 in 1977--testifies powerfully to the urgency of clearly articulating a college mission and concentrating on a manageable set of objectives. The decades of the sixties and seventies, the era of Miami-Dade's beginnings, saw an erosion both of general education coherence and consensus, as students of diverse race, language, and culture entered the institution. Miami-Dade personnel expended enormous effort simply keeping pace with this expansion. Too, the problems of dealing with the intellectual consequences of the "open door" policy, with student militance, and demands for individual choice, as against curricular prescription, presented stout challenges to educators and state officials determined to anchor the community college curriculum in common endeavors.

It was fiscal pressure, however, which finally mobilized the forces of curricular reform. In its opening analysis the Miami-Dade

⁴²

General Education in A Changing Society, Op. Cit., p. 54.

⁴³

Ibid., pp. 3-4.
plan discusses the tensions between open access in the community

colleges and shrinking fiscal allocations:

On the one side, the federal government by its financial aid and equal access/equal opportunity policies is encouraging more students to attend college. On the other side, the state governments are allocating fewer funds for operating the college's institutional programs. 44

In contradistinction to the Los Medanos plan which sought less instrumental, more intrinsically valorized goals, the Miami-Dade model was a response to governmental pressure at the state and county levels to improve both the quality and the cost effectiveness of post secondary education.

Still, the Miami-Dade plan was far from being narrowly instrumental in conception. Its formulators brought to the curriculum reform process rich insights into the goals of community college education, to wit:

General education at Miami-Dade college is that which has as its fundamental purpose the development and integration of every student's knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences so that a student can engage effectively in a lifelong process of inquiry and decision-making. 45

General education at Miami Dade evoked a traditional commitment to civic purpose in asserting that these same skills, knowledge, and attitudes were "fundamental to every individual's effort to have a satisfactory life and to function as a more effective citizen." 46

44

Ibid., p. 8.

45

Ibid., p. 29.

46

Loc. Cit.

Moreover, the rationale statements which proposed to justify the

Miami-Dade model noted the connection between integrated knowledge and decision making skills and "effective voting," and between one's "understanding of democratic principles and values (and one's ability) to cope with political and social issues.

47

Explicit aims of curricular reform were basic skills enhancement and the upgrading and strict enforcement of academic standards. To enter the communications core course, for example, students had first to satisfy threshold proficiencies in reading and writing (Table 7.1). A core of five interdisciplinary courses, aimed at providing both intellectual coherence and the sense of a common undertaking were required before, in the second, "distribution," and third, "free election" phases, students were encouraged to follow their interests. Even as students in the range of two-year curricula--Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, and Associate in General Studies--went their separate ways, they were to share a common core of intellectual and cultural knowledge. The common core requirement insured that Miami-Dade students would share a "universe of discourse" wherein general education goals would be taken up in the context of integrative learning. Additionally, Miami-Dade's general education goals were to be addressed in all courses where that was feasible. Clearly, the Miami-Dade general education curriculum was responsive to what Freeman Butts had so perspicuously thematized in his civic education curriculum as "unum" and "pluribus," the dual legacies of our democratic experience.

47

Ibid., p. 31.

Table 7.1: The Miami-Dade General Education Model

General Education Requirements for the Associate in Arts Degree				
Basic Skills				
Math Competency (Required for Graduation)		Reading & Writing Competency (Required for the Core Communications Course)		
General Education Core				
Communications	Humanities	The Social Environment	The Natural Environment	The Individual
Required single, multi-disciplinary courses—15 credits.				
Distribution Groups				
Communications	Humanities	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences	Physical Education
English Composition Creative Writing* Introduction to Literature* Speech*	Art Drama Foreign Language Literature Music Philosophy Interdisciplinary Humanities	Anthropology Economics Geography History Political Science Psychology Sociology Interdisciplinary Social Sciences	Biology Chemistry Earth Sciences Mathematics Physics Interdisciplinary Natural Sciences	Physical Activities Health Maintenance
3 credits *Can be selected only if English Composition competencies have been met.	Four courses, including at least one from each of these three groups, are required—12 credits. Each campus will designate a short list of courses for each group; the discipline areas listed here are only illustrative.			2 credits (These credits are not included in the 36-credit general education requirement.)
Electives				
6 credits—selected from a collegewide list.				
General Education Requirements for the Associate in Science Degree				
Basic Skills				
Math Competency (Required for Graduation)		Reading & Writing Competency (Required for the Core Communications Course)		
General Education Core				
Communications	Humanities	The Social Environment	The Natural Environment	The Individual or Health Maintenance

Source: General Education in a Changing Society, p. 57.

At Miami-Dade, however, the emphasis seemed to be greater upon individual growth than upon community welfare: more upon the autonomy of the person than upon the bonds of social and cultural solidarity, and more an attempt at cosmopolitan individualism than cosmopolitan civism. Recalling the general education ideal of Arthur Cohen, that it be a required course of study for all students, that it be interdisciplinary and integrative, that it be promotive of both the "freedom of the informed citizen" and social cohesion, and that it be

48
action-oriented, Miami-Dade's model responded mainly to the first two
criteria. Despite occasional references to citizenship in its
49
rationale statements, there is very little explicit mention of the
civic goals of general education learning. Citizenship, it appears,
is mainly a matter of problem-solving and decision-making, not sharply
distinguishable from the activities of consumers in the marketplace
employing a procedure which, once mastered, would be applicable in
50
diverse contexts.

Each of the twenty-six general education goals, distributed
among six functional categories, were related to individual needs:
for communicative and quantitative survival skills, for self and
inter personal knowledge, for career choice and development. These
categories included "Fundamental Skills," "The Individual," "The
Individual's Goals for the Future," "The Individual's Relationships
with Other Persons and Groups," "Society and the Individual," and
51
"Natural Phenomena and the Individual."

48
These are themes developed by Cohen and Florence Brawer in a
number of books and articles including "Private Concerns and Major
Concepts," Op. Cit., The American Community College (San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass, 1989), "The Case for General Education in the Community
College," Op. Cit., and "General Education and the Community College,"
ERIC DIGEST, Dec. 1988.

49
General Education in a Changing Society, Op. Cit., pp. 30-33
and 38-40.

50
Recall, here, the objections to the problem-solving and
decision-making models of democratic citizenship advanced by Henry
Giroux and Cleo Cherryholmes, Op. Cit.

51
General Education in a Changing Society, Op. Cit., pp. 35-37.

One suspects that some of the objectives are unrealistic.

Expecting that all students will acquire cross-cultural "literacy," fluency in the comparative history of ideas, knowledge of philosophy of science, and be able to "apply their knowledge of social principles
52 as enlightened individuals," seems overly ambitious. That in itself,

however, is less interesting than the exceedingly individualistic orientation of the whole program. Perhaps because Miami is so culturally, linguistically, and racially diverse, the notions of community and commonality which elsewhere have inspired general
53 education reform, have been supplanted by personal survival concerns-- knowledge integration for problem solving, self-actualization, lifelong learning, interpersonal communication on behalf of personal empowerment, lifestyle choices, and life adjustment. If "survival," in fact, won out over "enrichment," democratic citizenship (oddly) seemed to have been relegated to the domain of nonessentials.

Miami-Dade planners pointedly rejected other less instrumental postsecondary general education rationales as harboring "untested assumptions," for example: the need for a broad education; the need to be exposed to various fields of learning; the need to be well-rounded; or the need to be well-grounded in the academic disciplines
54 as a prelude to specialized study. In choosing an individualistic

52

Ibid., pp. 36-7.

53

See Boyer and Levine, A Quest for Common Learning: The Aims of General Education, Op. Cit.

54

General Education in a Changing Society, Op. Cit., p. 30.

model Miami-Dade rejected the social and cultural elitism of the traditional "liberal arts" curriculum, but also the disciplinary-based inquiry approach of the Harvard "core" with its similarly individualistic ethos allied not with survival themes, but with unacknowledged, perhaps unrecognized, class-based biases concerning the prospective social roles of its graduates.

In distinguishing Miami Dade's individualism from Harvard's I am making a case for the community college's uniqueness among post-secondary institutions respecting general education curricula. They are obliged to create models which are tangible, and connected to practical goals. Thus, it is not surprising that at Miami- Dade pluribus has so clearly overwhelmed unum, and that greater attention was not given to reining in the centrifugal forces of social atomization which E. D. Hirsch has sought to restrain with a thin veneer of cultural literacy. Neither is it surprising (though regrettable) that individualism at Miami-Dade was more attuned to life-adjustment than to personal empowerment and emancipation themes. That emphasis does not alone account for the relative weakness of citizenship concerns in the program; Johnson's functionalist model raised democratic citizenship objectives above all other general education goals. The distinction, which bears quite different curricular implications, is between a functionalism conceived mainly in terms of individual needs, as against one which seeks to balance private with public needs.

To summarize, the Miami-Dade model is admirable in many respects, for example, its clear rationale, responsiveness to its social and institutional setting, its blending of instrumental and intrinsic learning aims, its interdisciplinary core, and its

developmental support for both students and faculty. However, it allocates very little for community in the civic sense, and that is problematical. In an environment so besieged by racial, ethnic, and cultural difference, the absence of deliberate and powerful efforts to nurture the grounds, instrumentalities, and sentiments of civic solidarity seems to me to be a serious flaw. Specifically, there is little discussion of democratic personality, of the moral dispositions and understandings which, as Rawls would have it, comprise the sort of overlapping consensus on justice which alone--with the exceptions (mainly passive) of national identity, common language, and geography --makes reasoned adjudication of conflict and social cooperation possible.

There is a wan reference in the goals statements to moral responsibility, but few curricular provisions for seeing to its
55
development. Likewise, there seems to be no particular attention paid to developing the communicative skills of either a liberal (Ackerman)
56
or a democratic (Stanley) forum. And the problems focus of the Los Medanos model which aims at nurturing the Deweyan aspirations for

55
The goals statements, Ibid., pp. 35-37, reference responsibility for the environment, and urge students to assess the impact of prejudice on their attitudes and actions, but there is not a sense of social obligation in the document. It is exceedingly individualistic and ego-centered.

56
Communication, Loc. Cit., is conceived in terms of social or interpersonal communications skills, a means available to students of achieving their own social adjustment and advancing their personal goals.

57

"social intelligence" in public life is missing from Miami-Dade's general education plan. In short the Miami-Dade plan lacks a civic focus which leaves it incomplete: an impressive achievement, but less fully an exemplar of "democratic education" than it might have been.

Los Medanos: A newly established community college, lacking entrenched faculty power enclaves, Los Medanos was able to create itself out of a unifying vision. It was to concern itself with themes of world citizenship and human survival and with the integration of knowledge related thereto. Its faculty and staff were to be hired to give curricular and pedagogical shape to those constitutive institutional ideals.

It could not have been an easy task to convince the supervisory district, the Board of Trustees, or the California educational bureaucracy of the importance and merits of the plan, especially in an environment of fiscal contraction, public tax resistance, and traditional biases favoring vocational-technical training over liberalizing education. That the plan was implemented at all is eloquent testimony to the intellectual and political acumen of its

57

Gouinlock, Op. Cit., pp. 52-72.

58

The original tradition in the community colleges of California, recall, was liberal, transfer-oriented education. The most recent tradition, however, coterminous with the expansive growth of the 1960's and 70's, emphasized occupational and terminal education.

sponsors, founding president Frank Carhart, and Chester Case, campus director of the general education project, who both wanted something more of general education than the "typical subject-centered, single-⁵⁹ discipline course oriented to the prospective major in the field."

Reflecting a Deweyan pedagogical commitment in distinguishing "general" from "liberal education, Case observed that "While liberal arts bends the student to the subject, general education bends the⁶⁰ subject to the student."

Many of the traditional sources of resistance to general education's coherence and vitality were either absent or overcome by the Los Medanos leadership. Anticipating resistance from a traditional campus organizational enclave, the planners elected simply not to have academic departments, a recourse unavailable to most reformers. General education at Los Medanos was to serve the "needs" of students, in contradistinction to the interests of department, academic discipline, transfer institution, faculty, employers, even, for that matter, students' "interests." The fully elaborated Los Medanos program (Table 7.2) is impressive indeed. It is thoughtfully conceived, coherent in relating its curriculum and pedagogies to its aims, and imaginatively deployed.

59

Chester H. Case, "Reformulating General Education Programs," in George B. Vaughan and Associates, eds., Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), p. 106.

60

Ibid., p. 109.

Table 7.2: Los Medanos College General Education Plan

Tier I Generic Courses (20-24 cr.)	Behavioral Science	Social Science	Biological Science	Physical Science	Language Arts	Humanistic Studies
Tier II Interdis- ciplinary Course (3 cr.)	This is a course in Humanistic Studies titled "An Ethical Inquiry into Societal Issues." Students investigate a minimum of five societal issues from the perspective of moral inquiry: "Energy and Ecology," "Population Explosion," "Equality and Justice by Race and Sex." Includes self-directed study projects. 1					
Tier III Interdis- ciplinary Course (3 cr.)	Students must take an interdisciplinary "capstone" course from one of the six generic distribution areas. It is a critical inquiry into a single societal issue: "Freedom and Responsibility of the Mass Media" (Language Arts), "Death and Dying" (Biological Sciences), "Change, A Look to the Future" (Social Science). Includes self-directed study projects. 2					
Basic Skills and Profic- iencies (5-12 cr.)	College Composition			3 Credits required		
	Reading and Composition			3 Credits or proficiency test		
	Applied Mathematics			3 Credits or proficiency test		
	Computer Literacy			2 Units or proficiency test		
	Physical Education			2 Credits in activity courses		
Comment	(1) These courses teach students the concepts, generalizations, and modes of inquiry unique to the disciplines comprising the field and common within the field. Courses must meet the General Education Breadth Requirement which stresses interdisciplinarity, modes of inquiry, aesthetics of knowledge, implications of knowledge, reading and writing assessment, creative thinking, creativity, and pluralism.					
	(2) SDS projects require students to do guided research and writing on a topic related to class study.					

Source: Adapted from Los Medanos College: The Educational Plan (1/83), and Charles C. Collins and Kenneth O. Drexel, General Education: A Community College Model (Pittsburg, Calif.: Community College Press, 1976).

Following required study in six courses representing "disciplinary families," students embark upon a series of integrative studies whose end is an enhanced understanding of societal problems, coupled with refinement of skills of ethical inquiry. Interdisciplinarity, progression from overview of social problems to intensive examination of a single problem, and close faculty supervision are features of this program whose ends are individual empowerment through social and intellectual understanding, and acquisition of inquiry skills in the context and interest of social improvement.⁶¹

The assumptions which informed the Los Medanos plan from the outset concerning the nature of learning, society, and schooling led to these educational propositions: (that it should) "be education for survival of the individual and society,...integrated and interdisciplinary, lead learners to explore ethical aspects of societal issues, and advance the belief that knowledge should lead to action."⁶² In the singularity of its intellectual formulation and in the impressive achievement of its implementation, Los Medanos has captured much of what I regard as the strong, or authentic, tradition in collegiate general education characterized by a problems orientation, a public

⁶¹

Ibid., p. 121, discussing the presumed benefits of a reformulated general education, the plan offers an optimistic scenario respecting general education's social goals: "vitalized general education programs across the nation could add positive support to the welfare, even survival, of society, as more and more learners expand their awareness of the world they live in, and become accustomed to exploring ethical aspects of societal issues with knowledge and skills."

⁶²

Ibid., p. 115.

concern--citizenship education and civic obligation--and an integrative approach to disciplinary knowledge and inquiry.

The Los Medanos model, at least in its conception, stands in sharp contrast to the plan at Miami-Dade. It is less occupied with individual than with social survival, and more attuned to the need for cognitive abilities and moral dispositions than narrow workplace skills and social adjustment strategies. Throughout, there is concern for social justice and for education which nurtures the capacity for critical and ethical evaluation.

The Los Medanos plan is especially interesting in light of its efforts to balance commitments to the disciplinary foundations of knowledge with equally strong commitments to interdisciplinarity and problem-solving. The plan attempts to broker the interests of reliable knowledge and inquiry and the interests of learners in integrating and applying that knowledge. While the plan itself makes little explicit provision for instruction in democratic citizenship, it is clear that such cognitive, ethical, and communicative skills as are developed through the "core" and "capstone" courses, are meant to serve that end. The Los Medanos, graduate, in effect,

will have attained...content and methods of thinking for being a responsible citizen [and] mastered... basic skills of reading, writing, calculating and speaking...for responsible citizenship in a democratic society. 63

Virtually all community college general education advocates have great admiration for the Los Medanos program; it truly is a remarkable achievement. What it lacks, however, is a satisfactory civic focus.

Lacking one, students may not be sufficiently schooled in the seminal concepts of liberal-democratic governance, nor in virtue of the commitment to disciplinary knowledge, adequately prepared in the interrogative skills and strategies of immanent critique. There needs to be, in short, a stronger effort to problematize democratic citizenship, and to elevate civic education aims in the general education curriculum.

Valencia Community College: The "interdisciplinary studies in general education" model at Valencia (Florida) Community College seeks to "re-integrate the curriculum and return to the original purpose of general education--to create an enlightened and liberated citizenry." The program is comprised of 24 credit hours of interdisciplinary course work focusing upon the western intellectual tradition. It features a campus-wide commitment to eighteen cognitive competencies grouped by ten subject areas: literature, mathematics, social science, natural science, philosophy, rhetoric, religion, art, architecture, and music. These eighteen competencies which are held to be isomorphic with the learning process, are stated as student "abilities":

1. to locate key ideas, thesis statements, or topic sentences
2. to paraphrase key ideas or passages
3. to comprehend a literal meaning and move to a symbolic, or implied meaning
4. to separate evidence from inference
5. to recognize underlying assumptions
6. to recognize different types of reasoning: inductive, deductive, intuitive

64

J. Luis Schlegel et al, "I.D.S.: Interdisciplinary Studies in General Education--A Program for the 80's," ERIC, Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, p. 4.

7. to view an idea and its exposition as a whole, and to see the relationship of a key idea and its medium of expression
8. to grasp the symbolic nature of language (verbal or representational)
9. to translate from one form of expression to another
10. to understand and use ratio reasoning
11. to understand the relationships and principles within a formula and draw inferences from it without performing a numerical calculation
12. to recognize and control variables in an experimental setting
13. to evaluate the clarity of others' work as well as one's own
14. to formulate one's own line of reasoning by drawing inferences from data and evidence
15. to visualize hypothetical outcomes of specific systems and/or being able to carry a line of hypothetical reasoning to its conclusion
16. to check personal reasoning for internal consistency
17. to express one's own ideas in a variety of modes (essay, poem, speech)
18. to choose and affirm ideas which are found personally satisfying.

By bringing these thought processes to bear upon disciplinary knowledge focused by integrative themes, Valencia proposes to help graduates become more effective decision-makers, acquire self-knowledge, and develop qualities which make them employable throughout their lives.

Despite its civic aspirations and its commitments to interdisciplinarity, the Valencia model seems to me to be somewhat overpowering intellectually for the community college clientele. It is more evocative of "great books/great ideas" thinking than is typically found at community colleges. In short, its aim is in the mainstream of the general education tradition, but its means are questionable. It appears to be pursuing its goal circuitously and more abstractly than seems prudent. Too, it says little concretely about civic virtue, social justice, consent, participation and communicative competence, concepts basic to democratic citizenship.

Johnson County Community College: The Johnson County (Kansas)

Community College rationale comments wisely upon the difficulty of fashioning successful general education programs where "the occupational program requirements...are market-driven, and [where] part-time, non-degree-seeking" students complicate the imposition of mandated curricula or courses. ⁶⁷ Because of such problems, Johnson County Community College created a general education program of forty-one credits, but for Associate in Arts students only, and a non-mandated alternative to distribution requirements at that. Although the program of foundational courses modeled on fields of inquiry and preserving disciplinary integrity is nicely conceived, its voluntary aspect and narrow, Associate in Arts focus leaves a great many students and faculty uninvolved and unaffected.

Several of the "foundational" courses and "special focus studies" are truly imaginative and interesting (in particular, the social science offering, "Power in Society," and the anthropology course, "Cross-Cultural Awareness"), and it is regrettable that all students are not required to enroll in them. Where general education aspirations seek civic commitment and the notion of a common enterprise in democratic citizenship, the Johnson County Community College model will seem inadequate. If, on the other hand, technical and occupational students and all associate in arts matriculants are obliged to take "foundational" and "special focus" courses, a great deal will have been accomplished.

65

Creating an Alternative Core Curriculum (Overland Park, Kansas: Johnson Community College, 1989), p. 3.

As it stands, the evolving program is insufficiently committed to citizenship education and civic competence, in spite of its overarching concern to remedy the flaws of an "educational system [whose] inability to develop even the most basic skills society requires of its citizens, has led colleges and universities to re-examine their...general education requirements." That said, there is a great deal which other community college practitioners can learn from the sophisticated and literate Johnson County Community College model.

These five models of community college practice should suffice to illustrate some important aspects of general and civic education curricular thinking. Virtually all community college general education programs pay lip service to the values of democratic citizenship --"an enlightened citizenry" (Johnson County Community College), "an enlightened and liberated citizenry" (Valencia Community College), a "more effective citizen" (Miami-Dade Community College), "survival of the individual and society" (Los Medanos Community College), and "preparation for citizenship as a central function" (Cedar Valley Community College)--but few have delved deeply into its intellectual, moral, and communicative presuppositions and commitments, and fewer still have provided for systematic instruction in its constitutive elements.

This inquiry has proposed to do both: to establish collegiate civic education's grounds and articulate its methods. To be successful in that endeavor, however, is to overcome the various oppositional and inertial forces in the community college environment which

constrain such inquiry and obstruct comprehensive curricular reform. The litany of institutional obstacles to effective general education⁶⁷ curricula applies, as well, to civic education. O'Banion's long list of problems to be overcome is emblematic of frequent complaints by its critics that the community college lacks a clearly delimited educational focus. The causes of this reputed absence of sharply focused institutional identity and purpose are ascribable, severally, to its social and economic role, the characteristics of its student body, and its position in the post-secondary education hierarchy.

First, the community college's self-chosen role as purveyor of services and dispenser of quick fixes in a consumer-driven model of education is problematical. Occupational education and training, in-service brush-up courses, business and industry training partnerships, ESL, literacy and study skills programs, human development and enrichment courses, and baccalaureate transfer curricula seem to comprise separate, semi-autonomous enclaves, all competing for institutional attention and resources. Small wonder, then, that programs like general and civic education which require comprehensive curricular planning, clear professional judgment, rigorous goal justification, coordination and cooperation across the institution, and courageous leadership, find such environments inhospitable.

67

See Terry O'Banion and Ruth G. Shaw, "Obstacles to General Education," in B. Lamar Johnson ed., General Education in Two-Year Colleges, Op. Cit., pp. 59-72. Despite the many obstacles which reformers encounter, the authors, p. 71, characterize general education as "the best idea that ever came down the pike for community colleges."

Second, weakly motivated, poorly prepared, drop-in/drop-out learners, siphon off energy and resources into remedial/developmental studies, away from other possible undertakings such as general/civic education. Also, part-time students who balance work with study, are obliged to select courses on grounds of workplace needs, or convenience; they exert pressure to disrupt sequenced curricula, and even "command" the formatting and scheduling of courses in ways detrimental to sound pedagogy. Academic standards have suffered from the consequent lack of continuity in teaching and learning, and faculty are discouraged from conceiving curricula in noninstrumental, integrated forms and formats.

Third, community colleges are ambivalent respecting their higher education role: whether, for example, to concentrate upon occupational/vocational or baccalaureate transfer programs. To emphasize the latter is to strengthen liberal arts and disciplinary learning, but very likely at the expense of coherent general education curricula; to stress the former could conceivably strengthen general education (probably of a narrowly instrumental type) while undermining the institution's claim to membership in an "academy" which has traditionally judged such claims in terms of conformance with standards of disciplinarity and scholarly research. Cohen and Brawer provide penetrating insight into these difficulties:

Confronted on the one side by universities wanting better prepared students and on the other by secondary schools passing through the marginally literate, captives of their own rhetoric to provide programs to fit anyone's desires, the community colleges erected a curriculum resembling more a smorgasborg than a coherent educational plan....

Their policies favored part-time students dropping in and out at will, whose choice of courses was often made more on the basis of convenience in time and place than on content. 68

All of these vexing problems which seem to conspire against purposeful, thoughtfully designed, intellectually coherent, and educationally significant general education programs have partial, though not complete, solutions. That is because such problems are not simply impediments to optimal community college performance; rather, each represents a legitimate and important aspect of the community college mission whose dynamism, reckoned in terms of its acute sensitivity and responsiveness to community needs, is testimony to the necessity of tempering educational theory with practical necessity. Its complex socio-economic role, diverse clientele, and marginality in higher education are intentional and important features of its institutional identity--features, after all, which lend credibility to its claim to being "democracy's college." Community colleges cannot, and should not wish to, escape their social environments nor their institutional cultures. They must seek to serve their communities by providing education for such diverse ends as literacy, enlightenment, entry-level employment, career upgrades, self-esteem, baccalaureate transfer--and democratic citizenship.

68

Cohen and Braver, The American Community College, Op. Cit., p. 311. Recently, much attention has been given to strengthening the "collegiate" (university parallel and transfer) role of the community college. The case has been argued most forcefully by Cohen and Braver, The Collegiate Function of Community Colleges (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987), by Judith Eaton, ed., Colleges of Choice (New York: MacMillan, 1988), and Alexander Astin, "Strengthening Transfer Programs," in Vaughan, ed., Op. Cit., pp. 122-138.

Now the difficulties which Cohen and Brawer chronicle have been greatly broadened and amplified just in the last decade by the consequences of urban decay and by heavy third world immigration with its attendant problems of language acquisition and enculturation. The challenges to the community college, consequently, are even greater now than in the two decades of rapid expansion in the 60's and 70's. Community colleges are fast becoming integral components of the nation's social welfare apparatus, and in danger thereby of losing their collegiate function. If the collegiate function of the community college is to be enhanced, as Cohen and Brawer have argued, it will likely be at the expense of some other mission of the institution unless resources sufficient to support all of its manifold undertakings can be garnered. In difficult fiscal times there are likely to be pressures brought to bear upon the secondary schools to shore up the basic mathematics and communications skills of their graduates, but for reasons which this inquiry ought to have rendered clear and compelling, the community college cannot be permitted to abandon its crucial general/civic education mission for basic and life skills literacy.

At the same time the ideological assault upon traditional educational and curricular ideals from advocates of difference and multiculturalism create demands, political pressures, and intellectual arguments which do not augur well for the varieties of general

69

Los Angeles City College, for example, reports that 34% of its students are non-native speakers. (The Christian Science Monitor, November 13, 1990, p. 1). This suggests that the differences which have existed between large urban community colleges and suburban colleges, already substantial, will become even greater.

education which have been popular in the past. These forces are at work at all levels of American education and in all types of post-secondary institutions, with different emphases to be sure, but their collective consequences are especially potent in community college environments.

70

The combined impact of these diverse forces upon the community college curriculum provokes two major and divergent curricular rationales which need somehow to be reconciled. On the one hand, academe's traditional grounding of curricular authority, the academic disciplines, have been weakened; on the other, there is a greater need than ever to create through the collegiate curriculum a "center that can hold": a common ground for social bonding in a culture overwhelmed by diversity. That social bond, I suggest, is comprised principally of our shared democratic citizenship. It is simultaneously a source of educational coherence--a common rationale for community college education in confusing times amidst a multiplicity of voices, needs, and demands--and a lifeline to the sort of dignity and self-esteem which flow from competent participation in the affairs

70

For example, discourse on culture, gender, and difference, is more evident at universities than at state or community colleges, impacting the latter principally through course and curricular modifications reflecting changes at transfer institutions. But the actuality of difference and multiculturalism, as against the arguments, are present in force, and making an already difficult educational environment even more so.

which impinge upon one's life and the welfare of one's family and
71
community.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GENERAL/CIVIC EDUCATION: A GENERIC MODEL

The purpose of the ensuing discussion is to specify, and justify in terms of its uniqueness, a community college adaptation of the generic collegiate model of general/civic education. It is to be an adjustment of the collegiate model in light of the associated problems of community college culture introduced above. The relevant factors include institutional mission, the structure of degree programs, and student/faculty characteristics as they shape the academic environment.

Institutional Mission: The dual transfer-occupational mission of the community college is the mark of its distinctiveness in postsecondary education. These equally important roles, however, are not easily reconciled because faculty and administrators frequently differ over questions of emphasis and allocation of institutional resources. If general/civic education is to be successful, therefore, it must be equally relevant to students and faculty in both programs. For practically-minded, technically-oriented students general/civic education must be concrete; for more philosophically-minded students it must possess depth and complexity. Community college students,

71

These themes receive strong endorsement from The Commission on the Future of the Community College, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National Center for Higher Education, 1988).

typically, are quite practical in outlook, and less intellectually curious than students in four-year colleges. That suggests that it is easy to make a case for practical education at the community college, but it does not necessarily mean that civic education's claim will automatically be supported above those of the marketplace, workplace, or academic discipline.

The community college justification of general/civic education, then, must lie in its capacity to bridge the occupational-transfer duality, and especially in advancing politically egalitarian ideals in support of participative citizenship. The appeal of general/civic education is, as Cohen puts it, to achieve "the freedom of the informed citizen." About community college student's rights and equal opportunities the faculty and administration are deeply solicitous--even aggressive. If civic education can be shown to advance the life prospects of their students, faculty will support it. That is the bottom line!

Consequently, the general/civic education curriculum must be carefully conceived, and not so abstract as to appear nebulous or intellectually pretentious to technical/occupational faculty, nor excessively technical or blandly uncritical to liberal arts faculty. A problem-oriented approach where abstraction is subordinated to pragmatic inquiry will have immediate appeal for both groups. Highlighting the importance both of a "core experience of common learning" and a practical orientation the Commission on the Future of Community

Colleges, for example, proposed that a general/civic education curriculum

should not only give students essential knowledge, but should also help them make connections across the disciplines. In the end, they should be able to apply their knowledge to contemporary issues.
(Emphasis added) 72

73

Cultivation of the moral dispositions and a sense of justice are civic means and ends which will need to be addressed systematically in courses which students from transfer and occupational curricula take together. And that is also the case respecting communication skills. What is of crucial importance is that students from technical/occupational and university parallel programs engage the subject matter and acquire the moral and discursive skills of democratic citizenship in a variety of contexts and, where feasible, together.

The diverse academic orientations, interests, and life goals to which these students are committed comprise a social microcosm and a challenging simulacrum of democratic civic practice. Moreover, students' connections to the larger community add a dimension of reality and urgency to discussions of local issues. The advantages which campus-based students have in building communities through

72

The Commission, Ibid., p. 32, conceives moral development in terms of civic virtue acquired through community service and altruism ("education at its best concerns itself with the humane application of knowledge to life), an eloquent rebuttal to the CCGI survey which separated such sentiments and commitments both from citizenship and general education.

73

Ibid., p. 18

residence life are partially offset by the commuter student's
74
connection to the dynamics of community life.

In sum, the community college mission impinges upon the civic education project by requiring that it be practical, problems-oriented, intentionally integrative respecting dualistic educational ends, more concrete than abstract, and connected principally to issues of concern in the local community. It must be of demonstrable importance to faculty across the institution: responsive to students' needs and promotive of their environmental competence.

Structures of Associate Degree Programs: Inasmuch as the degree programs of the community college include university parallel, technical and pre-professional, and vocational/occupational concentrations, the points of curricular convergence may be few. In most associate degree configurations the arts and sciences content serves to differentiate types. From Associate in Arts, to Associate in Science, to Associate in Applied Science, to Associate in Occupational Studies (the New York scheme) the arts and sciences

74

The Commission, *Ibid.*, pp. 29-49, and *passim*, deeply influenced by Robert Bellah's work, urge community college leaders to attend to the challenges of community building on campus and between the college and its citizenry. They extend the metaphor, as well, to the international community.

content diminishes from three-quarters, to one-half, to one-third, to
75
none.

If the arts and sciences traditionally (and necessarily) have been at the heart of civic education, the degree structures and program enrollments at Community colleges pose difficult problems. Since at many institutions the majority of students are enrolled in occupational programs, that portion of the degree allotted to the arts and sciences will be clearly delimited, and faculty will resist encroachments upon their occupational concentration turf. Whether or not civic education programs can be, or even ought to be, encompassed within arts and sciences courses is at issue. Given the nature of associate degree structures and matriculation patterns one obvious answer is that arts and sciences courses alone cannot do the job. Another is that all faculty in all curricula should take ownership of the program in general/civic education. That suggests the necessity of both course and curricular and co-curricular

76
infusion. Program courses must be designed so as to nurture citizen-

75
The findings of The Higher Education Surveys, Survey Number 7, Undergraduate General Education and Humanities Requirements (Washington, D.C.: NSF, USDE, January, 1989), p. 23, that 90% of two-year colleges require "a minimum of 30.5 semester credit hours in general education [and] a minimum of 12.6 credit hours in the humanities," suggests that there is ample opportunity for developing coherent general education programs. There is some reason, however, to question the accuracy of institutional reporting. See Eugene J. Sullivan and Penelope W. Suritz, General Education and Associate Degrees: A National Study (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1978), and Leslie Koltai, National Task Force to Redefine the Associate Degree (Washington, D.C.: AACJC, 1983), pp. 33-34.

76
"The response, we believe," said the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, Op. Cit., p. 18, "should be to integrate general education within the specialized studies program--through interdisciplinary courses, special seminars, and the like."

ship education learning objectives, and the extracurriculum must be intentionally organized for the same end. And civic education learning goals must be paramount at the few, but important, points of curricular convergence.

In light of these circumstances, then, civic education goals and programs must be specified in readily comprehensible terms: as the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions which all students are to acquire and demonstrate. Beyond the ensemble of basic expectations, degree faculty can choose to strengthen civic education in ways commensurate with clearly articulated and more expansive concepts of civic competence. Having previously discussed (Chapter Four) the shortcomings of an exclusively infusionist model of general and civic education, the necessity of adjusting the ideal model in the face of practical considerations is manifest; the community college generic model will need to be substantially infusionist. Faculty and administration will have to work closely together to achieve these common goals. That will include jointly structuring courses in the humanities and social sciences which address the institution's general/civic education learning goals, de-emphasizing purely disciplinary attachments, and bolstering interdisciplinarity. That realization and the initiatives to which it must give rise summons forth all of the associated problems of institutional culture and climate.

Institutional Culture and Climate: The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges offered this incisive perspective on the characteristics of institutional culture which complicate the instructional tasks of general/civic education:

Constraints of time often restrict the building of teaching and learning communities... [where] more than two-thirds of the students and over half of the faculty [are] part-time. Approaches that may work for residential, full-time students who are young, well-prepared, and free of responsibility often are inappropriate for commuting, part-time, adult students with work and family responsibilities. 77

Traditional assumptions governing students at residential campuses do not apply at community colleges. An important consequence of these associated patterns of study, work, and commuting, pertinent to general/civic education, is that students do not have the benefit of leisure, nor as many occasions for conversation, which at residential colleges can and do in time, lead to wide-ranging intellectual discussion and numerous opportunities for developing one's skills in critical dialogue. Nor do co-curricular or extra-curricular programs at community colleges involve as many students--or faculty--as they ought to. There is reason, thus, to question the wisdom of regarding such programs as "extra"-curricular, hence voluntary, and compelling grounds for making them "co"-curricular, hence required. Improving the civic competence of students is, some believe, adequate justification for infringing upon the free choice of students and faculty by making participation mandatory.

The Commission also drew attention to the circumstances of faculty employment which impinge upon instructional tasks, and especially those, like general/civic education in the infusion mode, which require something extra. The combination of heavy course loads, overwhelming student numbers, and the difficulties of teaching

students of wide-ranging aptitude and motivation, prompted the Commission to recommend that

community colleges...review carefully the matter of class size and teacher load, especially in the core general education program where essential courses are often the most crowded and in developmental sequences where individual attention is most critical. 78

Reducing overall student load is important if faculty are to have the time to work on cross-curricular goal-setting. Reducing class size is crucial if the goals of general/civic education which require closely supervised, highly participative critical discourse and writing, employing a variety of student-centered learning formats, are to be realized.

Finally, while community colleges rely heavily upon adjunct faculty, and need to, in light of the broad range of programs and courses which must be offered in order to fulfill the college's mission, that feature of institutional culture poses difficult problems for the general/civic education agenda. Adjunct faculty in the arts and sciences, typically graduate students at local universities, more so even than full-time faculty, are attached to their academic disciplines. Where learning objectives such as characterize general and civic education are not discipline-specific, and where the optimal course and curricular arrangements consist of

78

Loc. Cit.

79

The Commission, Loc. Cit., cited a report by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching indicating that "75 percent of the community college respondents said their loyalty to their academic discipline was most important to them..."

interdisciplinary, as against multidisciplinary, courses and across-the-curriculum infusion efforts, rigid attachment to one's discipline
80
obstructs integrative education.

There are sound curricular and pedagogical reasons why introductory courses in the relevant academic disciplines--economics, sociology, U. S. History, political science--ought not to comprise the general/civic education core. There are other reasons, as well, why reliance upon adjunct faculty jeopardizes the institution's general/civic education goals. Adjunct faculty in the aggregate are not used, at first, to viewing learning from the perspective of learners, nor are they sensitive to students' difficulties in making meaning from new information: the reflective task of integrating newly acquired concepts into their complex, diversely configured conceptual schemas. Over time, as a result of experience and reflection thereon, faculty generally come to pay greater attention to students' learning problems; most find the challenge interesting. Community college faculty, in particular, by virtue both of the large numbers of students needing remedial coursework and the wide range of their

80

Kenneth A. Strike, Liberty and Learning and Educational Policy and The Just Society, (EPJS), Op. Cit., presents a stout defense of disciplinary knowledge stemming from an anti-empiricist epistemology based upon "the authority of received ideas." This view finds reinforcement in Phillip Phoenix, Realms of Meaning, Op. Cit., and Paul Hirst, Knowledge and the Curriculum, Op. Cit., as well as implicit recognition in the Harvard "Core's" domains of inquiry. However, Strike's view on the importance of civic education in the public school curriculum ("the predominant public task of the school," EPJS, p. 255), and in the constitutive features of democratic citizenship ("political competence, participation, and an appropriate sense of justice," EPJS, p. 251), appears to raise few objections against interdisciplinary courses, assuming faculty competence respecting relevant disciplinary knowledge.

students' abilities and backgrounds, take the problematics of teaching and learning seriously.

So despite strong commitments to their disciplines, (weaker by far than university faculty), full-time faculty at community colleges can be induced to prepare and participate in interdisciplinary courses whose learning aims transcend disciplinary boundaries and are somewhat more instrumental than the course goals which they ordinarily establish. As noted previously, community college faculty are attuned to practical learning outcomes, and insofar as citizenship education has pragmatic aspirations--competence and participation--and is thought to be important, faculty will work together diligently in its behalf. The challenge is to convince them of civic education's importance.

Considerations respecting mission, degree program structures, and institutional culture require that the generic collegiate model of general/civic education be adapted in clearly specifiable ways to community college circumstances. The generic community college model, consequently, will have the following features:

1. a practical, problem-solving intent and design which includes inquiry into public issues affecting the local community
2. interdisciplinary "core" courses combined with course infusion efforts across the curriculum
3. a co-curricular program which reinforces general/civic learning and is mandatory
4. opportunities for voluntary community service
5. active student participation in learning through group and individual research and debate
6. instructional strategies designed to help students to become communicatively competent
7. a pedagogy emphasizing critical inquiry and moral critique.

A Generic Model for Community College General/Civic Education

Below (Table 7.3) is a schematic rendering of learning objectives for a community college model of general/civic education.

Table 7.3 General/Civic Education Goals

Knowledge, Information Skills	Moral Dispositions: Virtues of democratic belief and practice	Participation
1. Concepts of liberal-democratic government	1. Fair mindedness	1. Self esteem and civic efficacy
2. U.S. Constitution and applications in case law	2. Mutual respect	2. Political competence
3. U.S. Government institutions and operation	3. Tolerance of opposing views	3. Communicative competence
4. A "liberal" theory of justice	4. Cooperative spirit	4. Group inquiry and deliberation and consensus building skills
5. A critical turn of mind and associated skills (a "critical theorem")	5. Civic (moral) courage to stand up for the right	
6. Local government issues, institutions, and procedures	6. Sense of civic duty	
	7. Concern for well-being of others	
	8. Community-mindedness	

Most of these objectives depend greatly upon prior learning, socialization, and moral development. In postsecondary education then, the major effort will be to reinforce prior learning which serves civic education goals, and beyond that, to extend and enrich students' understandings of what liberal justice requires of our social institutions, and what a democratic way of life requires of citizens respecting their moral outlooks and their participation in public affairs. The instructional method appropriate for these ends consists principally of critical interrogation of the origins and effects of social problems mediated by concepts which comprise a liberal-democratic theory of justice. In critical dialogue students

will also develop their capacities for cooperation and conflict resolution skills.

In Table 7.4 are courses through which students could acquire and reinforce the knowledge and skills, the moral dispositions, and the participative competences requisite to effective democratic citizenship. The attempt is to translate the common concerns of the philosophers and theorists discussed in Chapter Six into a curriculum matrix on community college general/civic education. Claims advanced in its behalf are four: first, that it encompasses a representative group of general education courses; second, that it constitutes a coherent program; third, that the pedagogies proposed are compatible with the skills and knowledge sought; and fourth, that all aspects are consistent with the emancipatory educational aspirations of a liberal-democratic form of life.

What is not essential to these claims is the status of the model's "correctness." The learning objectives and modalities are neither arbitrary nor exact. They are reasonable expectations and realistic strategies, but they will need to be adjusted in light of classroom experience and in terms of the dynamic interplay between theory and practice. Furthermore, such a civic education matrix ought not to be constructed as a solitary undertaking. As with the collaborative and discursive tenor of its pedagogy, the model itself needs to be reviewed critically by the whole faculty and renegotiated. The virtue of the matrix, then, like Butts's "decatalogue," is in its potential to stimulate thought and conversation.

Table 7.4: Core Courses and Program Courses Which Address Civic Learning Objectives

Objectives Courses	Concepts of Liberal Democratic Govern- ance	Knowledge of U.S. History and Government	A Moral Point of View	Critical Inquiry Skills	Participative Skills	Service/Altruism/ Moral Sentiments	Communicative Competence
English core courses in Composition/ Rhetoric	-Read, discuss, write about pub- lic issues bearing on rights, equality, social justice	-Write on polit- ical theme re- quiring his- torical inquiry	-Respect for persons -Tolerance of opposing views -Open inquiry viz emancipa- tion -Pluralism	-Rhetoric -Critical dis- course -Research -Evaluation of reasons, evi- dence	-Collaborative inquiry -Presentation -Debate -Constructing meaning to- gether	-Observe and write on aspect of pub- lic or private assistance to needy	-Process writing -Debate -Critical read- ing -Dialogic note- book -Rational persua- tion
Interdisciplin- ary core in Social Science	Every course in this category must address each of the civic learning objectives, but allowing for slightly different emphasis.						
Public Affairs Public Policy Social Problems	-Butt's decalogue -Liberal equality -Contract -Distrib. justice -Consent/partic. -Rational and moral autonomy	-Historical roots of public problems (1) -Polit. institu- tions and be- havior -Public policy making (2) -Constitutional case law	-Theory of Justice (1) -Rights and duties -Respect for persons -Equality/fair equality of opportunity -Capacity for moral judgment	-Problem solving -Research -Debate -Social intelli- gence -Reflective equilibration -Ideological critique -Moral critique -Immanent critique -Practical reason	-Democratic forum -Voting -Curriculum and extracurricu- lum -Survey research -Collaborative inquiry/learn- ing	-Engender empathy via inquiry and discussion and role playing	-Public discourse -Debate -The force of the better argument -Rational persua- sion -Strategic vs communicative action -Critique of speech acts
Science, Technol. Society Technology and the En- vironment	-Freedom vs. re- sponsibility -Market values and quality of life -Democratic control and consequences	-Legislation on science, tech., society -History en- vironmental policy	-Ethical treat- ment of persons -Medical ethics -Moral evalua- tion of tech. -Obligations to future genera- tions (2)	-Critique of tech- nocratic ration- ality -Critique of ideo- logical natural- ism and environ- mentalism	-Collaborative inquiry -Discussion and debate -Attending local govern- ment meetings	-Concern for others -Responsibility for environment	-Critique of technical ration- ality -Critique of speech acts
American Studies	-Social philosophy and theory -Liberal tradition in America -Unum/pluribus	-American national char- acter -Soc./intell. history -Sources of con- flict/comity	-Pluralism -Multicultural- ism -Overlapping consensus on justice	-Comparative studies of cul- ture and national character	-Historical and cultural competence on behalf of civic	-"Habits of the heart" -Civic virtue	-Dialogue -Ideological critique -Myth critique
Community Intern	-Equality and equal opportunity -Distributive justice	-Local govern- ment -Welfare system -Constitution -Hist. voluntarism	-All of above	-Theory and practice -Reflection -Discussion	-Involvement in community -Voluntarism	-Empathy/mutuality -Caring -Service	-Skill development -Competence

Table 7.4 (Continued)

Mathematics Courses				-Quant. analysis -Critical inquiry into uses, mis-uses of data -Statistical methods in public affairs research	-Inquiry -Discussions on public issues and statistical data		-Critical acumen re data manipulation -Critical view of quantitative representation (Distortion)
Science Courses	-Democracy and free inquiry -Responsibility to uphold standards of inquiry		-Ethical issues in scientific research -Ethics of technological application of scientific research (DNA)	-Acquaintance with modes of inquiry -Problem solving -History of science -Kuhnian science	-Collaborative inquiry and learning -Personal involvement in experiments		-Acquaintance with scientific discourse -Subjectivity and objectivity -"Value-free" science
Humanities core "capstone" course	A course which all students must take, and in which they are distributed randomly, without regard to their curricula. Students will read and discuss provocative essays and literary works rich in moral content which stimulate critical reflection. Students will be required to discuss and debate controversial issues, and to develop their own rational arguments which they defend before the group and which they write about in formal and informal assignments. All of the associated skills, knowledge, and moral dispositions of democratic citizenship will be incorporated in the course. The expectation is that students (and faculty) will continue the conversation outside the classroom.						
"Program" -technical -occupational -vocational -career Courses	Faculty in all of the college's curricula will incorporate civic education learning objectives where that proves feasible. At the very least, they will strive to teach and model critical reasoning and evaluation, advocate and provide for student participation in the learning process, promote moral awareness and responsibility, and enhance communication skills.						
Comments	All faculty need to acquire a keener understanding of liberal-democratic philosophy and theory	(1) This program builds on high school sequences in U.S. History and government (2) Includes critical appraisal of the public policy model	(1) Rawlsian theory of liberal justice including: -overlapping consensus -priority of "right" -fair equality of opportunity -neutrality re good (2) Global sense of environmental responsibility	The idea here is to establish a generic notion of critical thinking and then encourage faculty in each field to deepen their understandings of critical inquiry and evaluation in a particular domain of inquiry	Participation means first, joining with others in dialogue on public issues/modelling the process of social intelligence, and second, engaging in various civic projects and activities	Students need to develop their capacities for empathy, and to consider to what degree they are obliged to be concerned for others--in the society and in the world	Fostering basic communication skills so that students can express their ideas as well as the critical powers which free thought from various constraints

The community college civic education matrix is a dual--core and infusion--model. The bulk of the civic learning agenda will be carried forward directly by the designated humanities and social sciences, but other arts and sciences courses, as well as "program" courses, have important contributions to make. The basic course in English composition will work at helping students to become better readers and writers by honing their critical and reflective thinking capacities, and by providing opportunities for improving their expressive abilities. Students will read, discuss, and write about social and political issues which require moral judgment and choice. They will be obliged to reason critically about such choices publicly and civilly, and to develop an appreciation of discursive agreements which accede to "the force (and authority) of the better argument." Students will also acquire an understanding of rhetoric: of the power of language to construct consciousness and meaning, to represent and misrepresent, to enlighten and obfuscate. And they will learn that the promise of personal and collective emancipation rests substantially upon knowledge and the critical appropriation of language in its behalf. Instructional methodologies will be such as to foster liberal-democratic moral values and dispositions: tolerance of opposing views, respect for persons, pluralism, and an egalitarianism which requires that the unequal exercise of power or authority be justified.

Interdisciplinary social science courses must take responsibility for a large share of civic education's learning objectives. There, the central concepts of liberal-democracy can be explicated, criticized, and applied in the context of public problems. Students' understandings of the moral requisites of liberal-democratic govern-

ance will be extended and deepened, and they will learn to investigate and appraise such issues as distributive justice, the limits of individual rights, and tensions between the right and the good. Students will develop their critical capacities by engaging in group dialogue, and by learning to question the assumptions, beliefs, and power relationships underlying truth claims and proposals respecting public policy initiatives. Faculty will be guided by the democratic forum ideal and by the ideal of communicative competence which aims at exposing distortions and reaching consensus in practical affairs.

A humanities "capstone" course which students take in their final semester (last 4-5 courses for part-time students) will focus upon the communicative competence, critical inquiry skills, and moral understandings and dispositions of participative citizenship. Students in all of the college's curricula will, thereby, share a common agenda. They will examine, reflect upon, discuss, and debate issues relevant to democratic citizenship together, and in virtue of that activity, comprise a college-wide discourse community to which faculty and staff will also be drawn. The "capstone" course will recapitulate, reinforce, and help students to reintegrate prior learning, but at a more sophisticated level. The aim of such discourse is to emulate what Gouinlock, following Dewey, terms social

81

The "discourse community" is emblematic of both the social and political aspirations of a democratic form of life. It is not, however, a "thick" community of the type which Strike, "The Moral Role of Schooling in a Liberal Democratic Society," *Op. Cit.*, depicts when inveighing against the "illiberal" blurring of society and polity, as with the Greek poleis. The "discourse community" is, constrained by its endorsement of liberal neutrality respecting the good.

intelligence, now rendered more reflective and critical through the conscious application of Habermasian speech theory.

Various other courses will take up civic education themes as noted. Mathematics instructors will help students to understand and interpret data and its statistical representation in social, economic, and political analysis in the interests of quantitative "literacy" and de-mystification. And science teachers will help students to understand the processes of scientific inquiry, the standards of scientific knowledge and truth, and the ethical dilemmas of research, all of which are pertinent to civic discourse.

82

The program's success ultimately will depend upon continual reinforcement of relevant skills, knowledge, and dispositions. Only where general/civic education objectives are infused into the entire curriculum and suffuse the institution's mission, its consciousness, and its organizational norms and procedures, can the program succeed fully. One is reminded of Dewey's insistence that democracy be visualized as a total way of life and not merely the means by which political leaders are selected and laws made. And those sentiments are shared by virtually all of the philosophers and theorists discussed herein, in particular, Habermas, Butts, Newmann, Gutmann, and Pratte.

82

The intuitive idea here is that science's dedication to systematic inquiry, its restraint, and its painstaking devotion to the evidentiary base of truth and knowledge claims can be instructive, as well, for moral/practical discourse. Metatheoretical arguments concerning epistemic and ontological foundations ought not to occupy civic educators very much.

It is well beyond the scope of this essay to specify exactly where, in each collegiate curriculum--business, health, sciences, engineering and engineering technology--citizenship learning goals are to be addressed. One thing is certain: it will be a time-consuming process, requiring a significant investment of faculty energy and good will. The campus, therefore, must "buy into" the general/civic education idea wholeheartedly at its inception in order to sustain the project through to a successful conclusion.

The core/infusion curricular program will need to be supported imaginatively in the institution's co-curricular and extra-curricular programs. In student-operated organizations and enterprises and in community volunteerism, there are valuable opportunities to apply and practice the knowledge and skills acquired in classrooms. Figure 7.5 identifies some likely sites of civic praxis and attempts to specify the sorts of relevant activities and learning outcomes which would likely result from such efforts.

Summary and Conclusion

This model of community college general/civic education incorporates as vitally important precisely those features--moral awareness, social justice, altruism, social criticism, participation, reform mindedness--which the Community College Goals Inventory paradigm detached from general education, and which survey respondents, consequently, relegated to the periphery of valorized learning objectives. Neither the CCGI protocols nor the survey responses, therefore, are particularly edifying concerning the concept of general /civic education or its status among community college personnel. The CCGI survey has raised more issues than it has settled.

Table 7.5: Other Sites of Civic Learning and Practice

Objectives Activities	Concepts of Lib.-Dem. Governance	Knowledge of U.S. History and Govern- ment	Moral Point of View	Critical Inquiry Skills	Participative Skills	Service/ Altruism Moral Sentiments	Communica- tive	Miscellan- eous
Co-curricular programming	Procure speakers and organize provocative programs which are responsive to these concerns, and especially, themes which address public problems.			Class discussion of issues raised	-Encourage student questioning -Require student attendance	Speaker/program choices	Discussion on program	Essential that whole campus participates
Student Government	Acquaintance with democratic procedures and governance rules.		-Concern for student body and campus -Fairness re treatment and resource distribution	-Discussion and debate -Reflect upon student rights and college good	-Direct participation in governing -Develop skills -Conflict/resolution	-Tolerance, fairness, courage	-Discussion/debate -Consensus	The challenge is to involve more students in campus governance; heighten interest
Campus Newspaper	Treat campus community, national, international news/issues	Research articles and raise legal/constitutional questions	Present ethical aspects of public problems and campus practices	-Standards of investigation -Contrasting view	Find ways to involve students (Opinion surveys)		-Maintain standards re writing and critique	Use newspaper to educate civically and involve students
Library			-Honesty in research and writing	-Library orientation -Librarian assistance	-Require student research		-Locate information -Seek diverse perspectives	
Community Service Voluntary Campus Service	-Practical grasp of organizational dynamics		-Acquire sense of social justice -Respect for persons	-Reflect upon issues of equity, welfare, distrib. justice	-Develop understanding of organizations -Personal involvement	-Concern and caring -Civic duty -Help fellow students/quests	-Social skills -Articulate views	
Campus Clubs	-Democratic decision-making		-"Associational morality" -Ego decenteration -Group welfare		-Planning -Participating -Taking responsibility	-Virtues of cooperation, loyalty, concern for group welfare	-Discussion/argument -Consensus	These would encompass "interest," "service," "curriculum," "major "

Inquiry into community college curriculum and the historical currents in which it has been enveloped confirmed my supposition concerning the close connection between general and civic education. In fact, all of collegiate general education thinking in this century has acknowledged civic learning integral to its goals.

The gulf between aspiration and performance, however, was found to be broad and deep, and owing principally to the disciplinary loyalties and research commitments of faculty and to higher education's reward system. Despite such pressures, college educators have left a rich legacy of exemplary programs which continue to inspire curriculum reformers.

Being more readily disposed to the virtues of instrumental learning than research universities and the scholarly guilds which dominate higher education, community colleges are more promising sites of general/civic education practices. It may well be that community colleges will take the lead in general/civic education and become catalysts for curricular reform throughout all strata of postsecondary education. All postsecondary institutions share a common agenda respecting civic education's conceptual, curricular, and pedagogical entailments, namely: a conception of the moral ground of democratic citizenship; the notion of communicative competence appropriate to rational participation in democratic discourse communities; and the indispensability of open inquiry and pragmatic experimentation to democratic forms of life. Together with a deeper knowledge both of liberal-democratic concepts and U. S. History and Government, these foundational commitments comprise a theory of

democratic citizenship and establish the curricular and pedagogical standards for a theory of collegiate citizenship education.

83

Civic education thus conceived, places a premium upon democratic traits of mind, character, and conversation which, in turn, are compatible with aspirations for social and personal emancipation and also with standards of scholarly (and disciplinary) inquiry. To adopt a design such as has been described and justified herein is, I submit, to restore coherence, civility, and purpose to the community college curriculum, and to help it balance its important egalitarian commitment to accessibility with its equally important, civically enabling promise to help students become politically competent. Students need to be given opportunities to attain economic competence but they also need to be helped to acquire the means to civic empowerment, for only in providing both can the community college realize fully its claim to being "democracy's college."

83

Civic objectives similar to these were recently endorsed by The American Association of Colleges in Frank Newmann, Higher Education and the American Resurgence (Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985), and, notably, by AAC President Mark Curtis, ("the advancement of civic learning...must become higher education's most central goal"), p. 32.

EPILOGUE

It seems a propitious moment to urge the general/civic education agenda upon college educators, not, as proposed elsewhere in this argument, because democratic citizenship is something which we all have in common, but rather, because it may soon be the only thing we have in common. Ongoing debates in the "academy" over canonicity, inclusion, power, and hegemony are illustrative of our difficulty in (re)defining cultural literacy. Our celebration of difference, the principle of pluribus (liberalism's pandora's box) has come home to roost. Our earnest discourses on western classicism and on the "well-educated man" have been made out to seem silly and self-serving, or worse, intentionally controlling and unacceptably ideological. The cacaphony of voices, strident and scholarly, cerebral and visceral, threatens to undermine the cultural and intellectual authority of western civilization and, not incidentally, our self-confidence. Viewed dispassionately, the process is merely one of the supersession of world views, the traditional paradigm unable both to account for anomalies in its environment and to colonize its adversaries.

It is an occasion perhaps to turn Habermas's argument inward: to recognize in our own crisis the opportunity to formulate a "more adequate" perspective. Like primitive societies undergoing modernization much that has been valued will be lost; the myths, meanings, relationships, and texts which brought coherence and purpose to the old will serve the new less adequately, as the pleadings and warnings of the displaced shamans of superannuated forms warn. But the lessons of recent history suggest that the forces of cultural diversity and diffusion, operating dialectically, more according to

the model of Hegel than Marx, provoke ever more comprehensive outlooks.

The implications for the general/civic education project are clear and insistent. First, "liberal" philosophy's belief in the rational and moral autonomy of the person accords quite well with the celebration of diversity. Liberalism's priority of right and the Rawlsian overlapping consensus in justice seem ready-made to provide and justify the tolerance and mutual respect which a heterogeneous society requires.

Second, amidst the seemingly incommensurable beliefs and value orientations of a diverse populace, increasingly segmented into thick communities, powerful affinities--racial, religious, linguistic and cultural, sexual, and generational--suggest that the grounds of common national and cultural identity and mutual endeavor will need to be eminently pragmatic. Thus, the attractiveness of the largely instrumental concern for democratic citizenship and civic education both in schools and colleges recommends itself as the common denominator (not the "lowest," however, considering the alternatives-- mutual antipathy, sports and T.V. addiction, consumerism, etc.) of a heterogeneous society. It is worth reflecting deeply upon Butts's characterization of American society in the twenty-first century as one optimally to be guided by a public philosophy of "pluralistic civism," for it has a joint appeal in being both practical and morally acceptable.

Finally, we must consider the implications of "pluralistic civism's" and "liberal justice's" cultural preeminence for the general/civic education curriculum. Precisely because there is no longer textual consensus on western culture, the common curricular

ground will need to be comprised of those elements upon which we can agree: the intellectual skills and moral dispositions useful for critical inquiry and public discourse, together with the shifting historical, theoretical, and descriptive resources of knowledge and information which can help people solve social conflicts and improve the quality of our lives. Since such civic skills and dispositions are the special preserve of no field of study in particular, they will need to be addressed, incorporated, and cultivated across the curriculum throughout all of higher education.

For each of these three reasons, then, claims concerning the civic ground of general education and its surpassing importance as a collegiate curricular concern seem to me to be compelling and adequately demonstrated. The American community college, if it so chooses, can light the way to the general/civic education challenge of collegiate education in the new century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A New Vitality in General Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1988.
- Ackerman, Bruce A. Social Justice in the Liberal State. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Adams, Hazard. "The Fate of Knowledge." Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Adler, Mortimer J. The Paideia Proposal. New York: MacMillan, 1982.
- _____. Program: An Educational Syllabus. New York: MacMillan, 1984.
- _____. Six Great Ideas. New York: MacMillan, 1981.
- Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba. The Civic Culture. Boston, Mass.: Little Brown, 1965.
- Apple, Michael, ed. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Arneson, Richard J. "Symposium on Rawlsian Theory of Justice: Recent Developments." Ethics. Vol. 99, July 1989.
- Arnold, Matthew. Culture and Anarchy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1869.
- Barber, Benjamin R. The Conquest of Politics. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- _____. Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1984.
- Bell, Daniel. The Reforming of General Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Bellah, Robert N. The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial. New York: Seabury, 1975.
- _____. "Creating a New Framework for New Realities: Social Science as Public Policy." Change. March/April, 1985.
- _____. "Transforming American Culture." The Center Magazine. Sept./Oct., 1986.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven Tipton. Habits of the Heart. New York: Harper and Row, 1985.

- Bennett, William J. To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984.
- Bennett, William J. and Edwin J. DeLattre. "Moral Education in the Schools." The Public Interest, 50 (Winter, 1978). 81-98.
- Bernstein, Richard. Beyond Objectivism and Relativism. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania, 1983.
- _____. Philosophical Profiles. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- _____. The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976.
- Bloom, Alan. The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.
- Bonham, George W. ed. The Great Core Curriculum Debate: Education as A Mirror of Culture. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1979.
- Bowers, Claude. Elements of a Post-Liberal Theory of Education. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1989.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Boyer, Ernest. College: The Undergraduate Experience in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.
- Boyer, Ernest L., and Abraham Kaplan. Educating for Survival. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Boyer, Ernest L., and Arthur Levine. Quest for Common Learning. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation, 1980.
- Bredo, Eric, and Walter Feinberg. Knowledge and Values in Social and Educational Research. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982.
- Brown, Alan. Modern Political Philosophy: Theories of the Just Society. Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1986.
- Broudy, Harry S. The Uses of Schooling. London: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1988.
- Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education: The Importance of Structure. New York: Vintage, 1960.

- Buchanan, Alan E. "Assessing the Communitarian Critique of Liberalism." Ethics. 1989. 852-882.
- Burke, Edmund. "Speech to the Electors of Bristol." Works. Vol. III, p. 11, 1974.
- Butts, R. Freeman. The Revival of Civic Learning. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Foundation, 1980.
- _____. 1982. "The Revival of Civic Learning Requires a Prescribed Curriculum." Liberal Education. Winter, 1988. 384.
- Cadwallader, Mervyn. "A Manifesto: The Case for an Academic Counter-revolution." Liberal Education. Vol. 68, No. 4, Winter, 1982.
- _____. "The Uses of Philosophy in an American Counterrevolution: Alexander Meiklejohn and John Dewey in the 1980's." Liberal Education. Winter, 1984. 275-93.
- California Framework Committee. A Framework for Public Education in California. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1950.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Hyattsville, Maryland: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.
- Case, Chester H. "Reformulating General Education Programs." George B. Vaughan and Associates Eds. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1983.
- Chapman, Charles E. "Aligning Priorities in Junior and Community Colleges." Current Issues in Higher Education. May 1965. 167-70.
- Cheney, Lynn V. Tyrannical Machines. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1990.
- Cherryholmes, Cleo H. "Social Knowledge and Citizenship Education." Curriculum Inquiry. 10:2, 1980. 115-39.
- _____. Power and Criticism: Poststructural Investigations in Education. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1988.
- The Christian Science Monitor. November 13, 1990.
- Clowes, Darrel A., Jeffrey D. Lukenbill, and Ruth G. Shaw. "General Education in the Community College: A Search for Purpose." Unpublished paper. Chicago, IL. April 29 - May 2, 1979.
- Cohen, Arthur M. "The Case for General Education in Community Colleges." Unpublished paper. May 22, 1978.

- Cohen, Arthur, ed. "New Directions in Community Colleges." General Education. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence Brawer. The American Community College. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1984.
- _____. The Collegiate Function of Community Colleges. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Collins, Charles C., and Kenneth O. Drexel. General Education: A Community College Model. Pittsburg, California: Community College Press, 1976.
- Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National Center for Higher Education, 1988.
- Committee on the Objectives of General Education in a Free Society. General Education in a Free Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Community College Goals Inventory. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1981.
- Creating an Alternative Core Curriculum. Overland Park, Kansas: Johnson Community College, 1989.
- Cremin, Lawrence. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Random House, 1961.
- Cross, K. Patricia. "Thirty Years Have Passed: Trends in General Education." 11-20 in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., New Directions for Community Colleges: General Education in Two-Year Colleges 40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- _____. "Community Colleges on the Plateau." Journal of Higher Education. April, 1981.
- Curtis, Mark H. "The Liberal Arts and the Civic Arts." Liberal Education. Winter 1988. 277-81.
- Dahl, Robert. A Preface to Democratic Theory. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Dallmayr, Fred R. Polis and Praxis: Exercises in Contemporary Political Theory. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1984.
- Deegan, William L., and Dale Tillery. Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
- Dewey, John. The Child and the Curriculum. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1902.

- _____. Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: MacMillan, 1916.
- _____. Experience and Education. New York: Collier MacMillan, 1938.
- _____. Liberalism and Social Action. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1963.
- _____. The Public and Its Problems. New York: Henry Holt, 1927.
- Diggins, John P. The Lost Soul of American Politics. New York: Basic Books, 1984.
- Doppelt, Gerald. "Is Rawls's Kantian Liberalism Coherent and Defensible?" Ethics. 1989.
- _____. "Rawls's Kantian Ideal and the Viability of Modern Liberalism." Inquiry. V. 31, 1988. 447.
- Dworkin, Martin S. Dewey on Education: Selections. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959.
- Eaton, Judith ed. Colleges of Choice. New York: MacMillan, 1988.
- Efland, Arthur D. "The Arts and Physical Education in General Education: A Canonical Interpretation," in Ian Westbury and Alan Purves, Eds., Cultural Literacy and the Idea of General Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Entwistle, Harold. Antonio Gramsci: Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Fenton, Edwin. Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- Ferrara, Alessandro. "A Critique of Habermas's Consensus Theory of Truth." Philosophy and Social Criticism. Vol. 13, No. 1, Fall, 1987.
- Fisch, M. ed. Classic American Philosophers. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.
- Forester, Joseph. Critical Theory and Public Life. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1985.
- Gaff, Jerry G. Ed. GEM Newsletter. Washington, D.C.: Project on General Education Models, 1979. 84.
- _____. General Education Today. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1983.
- Galston, William. Justice and the Human Good. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1980.

- _____. "Moral Personality and Liberal Theory: John Rawls's 'Dewey Lectures.'" Political Theory. Vol. 10, No. 4, November 1982.
- Gilligan, Carol. In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1982.
- Giroux, Henry A. Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.
- _____. "Critical Theory and Rationality in Citizenship Education." The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1983.
- _____. The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1983.
- _____. "Public Philosophy and the Crisis in Education." Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 54, No. 2, May, 1984.
- Giroux, Henry A., and Stanley Aronowitz. Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal, and Radical Debate Over Schooling. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey, 1985.
- Gleazer, Edmund. "The Community College Mission in an Age of Social Revolution." William K. Ogilvie and Max Raines Eds. Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1971.
- Gouinlock, James. Dewey's Theory of Moral Deliberation. Ethics, Vol. 88, No. 3, 1978. 218-28.
- _____. Excellence in Public Discourse. New York: Columbia University, 1986.
- Graff, Gerald. "The Humanist Myth." Professing Literature: An Institutional History. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Grant, Gerald and David Riesman. The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- _____. The World We Created at Hamilton High. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1988.
- Gray, A. A. "The Junior College in California." The School Review. 23 (September 1915). 465-73.
- Greene, Maxine. "Excellence: Meanings and Multiplicity." Teachers College Record. Vol. 86. 283-97.
- _____. Landscapes of Learning. New York: Teachers College Press, 1981.

- Gutmann, Amy. "The Central Role of Rawls's Theory." Dissent, Summer, 1989. 339.
- _____. "Communitarian Critics of Liberalism." Philosophy and Public Affairs. Vol. 14, No. 3, Summer, 1985.
- _____. Democratic Education. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Habermas, Jurgen. Communication and the Evolution of Society. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1979.
- _____. Legitimation Crisis. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1975.
- _____. The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity. Twelve Lectures. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1987.
- _____. "On Systematically Distorted Communication." Inquiry. Vol. 13, 1970. 205-18.
- _____. The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1984.
- _____. "Towards a Theory of Communicative Competence." Inquiry, Vol. 13, 1970. 370-76
- Hammons, J. O. "A Missed Opportunity Returns." Arthur Cohen Ed. General Education: New Directions in Community Colleges Number 25. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Hammons, J. O., and S. A. Ward. "General Education in the Community College: Past, Present, Future." Unpublished manuscript. School of Education, University of Arkansas, 1978.
- Hampton, Jean. "Should Political Philosophy be Done Without Metaphysics?" Ethics. 1980. 791-814.
- Hartz, Louis. The Liberal Tradition in America. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.
- _____. The Founding of New Societies. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- Henderson, Algo D. and Jean G. Henderson. "Revitalizing General Education in the Community College." Unpublished paper. Montgomery College, May 22, 1978. 3-4.
- Hirsch, E. D. Cultural Literacy: What Every Literate American Needs to Know. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.
- Hirst, Paul. Knowledge and the Curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

- Hoff Sommers, Christina. "Ethics Without Virtue: Moral Education in America." The American Scholar. Summer 1984.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. Dialectic of Enlightenment. New York: Continuum Publication Co., 1987.
- Hutchins, Robert M. The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1953.
- _____. 19. The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University, 1936.
- Hyman, Robert. Political Socialization. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1959.
- Integrity in the Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1985.
- Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1984.
- Iversen, Robert. The Communists and the Schools. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959.
- Janowitz, Morris. The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for Civic Consciousness. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1983.
- Jennings, M. Kent, and Richard G. Niemi. "The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child." American Political Science Review, Vol. 2, September, 1968.
- Johnson, B. Lamar. General Education in Action: A Report of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952.
- _____. General Education in Two-Year Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- _____. "Toward General Education in the Junior College." Junior College Journal 30 (May), 1960. 517-24.
- Johnson, Mauritz. Intentionality in Education: A Conceptual Model of Curricular and Instructional Planning and Evaluation. Albany, New York: Center for Curriculum Research and Service, 1977.
- Jones, Richard M. Experiment at Evergreen. Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman, 1981.
- Keller, Phyllis. Getting at the Core: Curricular Reform at Harvard. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1982.

Kennedy, Gail. Education for Democracy: The Debate Over the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Boston, Mass: D. C. Heath, 1952.

Ketcham, Ralph. Individualism and Public Life. New York: Basil and Blackwell, 1987.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. "Freedom in a Collectivist Society." Social Frontier 1. April, 1935.

Kitto, H. D. F. The Greeks. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1951.

Kliebard, Herbert. "The Liberal Arts Curriculum and Its Enemies: The Effort to Redefine General Education," in Ian Westbury and Alan Purves, Eds., Cultural Literacy and the Idea of General Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Koltai, Leslie. National Task Force to Redefine the Associate Degree: A Preliminary Presentation. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1983.

Koos, Leonard V. "Current Conceptions of the Special Purposes of the Junior College." The Junior College Movement. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co., 1925.

_____. The Junior College Movement. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co., 1925.

Kymlicka, Will. "Rawls on Teleology and Deontology." Philosophy and Public Affairs. Vol. 17, No. 3, Summer 1988. 173-90.

Lamont, Corliss. Humanism as a Philosophy. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949.

Lasch, Christopher. The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations. New York: W. W. Norton, 1979.

Levine, Arthur. Handbook of the Undergraduate Curriculum. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Levine, Arthur and David Haselkorn. "Liberal Education's Civic Agenda." Liberal Education. March, 1985.

Lewis, Laurie L. and Elizabeth Farris. Undergraduate General Education and Humanities Requirements. Washington, D.C.: Higher Education Survey Reports, 1989.

Lippmann, Walter. The Public Philosophy. New York: New American Library, 1955.

Los Medanos College: The Educational Plan. Pittsburg, CA: Community College Press, 1976.

- Lukenbill, Jeffrey D., and Robert H. McCabe. General Education in a Changing Society. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade Community College, 1978.
- Lukes, Steven. "Some Problems About Rationality." Bryan Wilson, Ed. Rationality. New York: Harper and Row, 1970. 194-213.
- Macedo, Stephen. Liberal Virtues: Citizenship, Virtue, Community in Liberal Constitutionalism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. After Virtue. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.
- _____. A Short History of Ethics. New York: MacMillan, 1966.
- MacPherson, C. B. The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- _____. The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Maguire, John D. "Toward a Definition of the Civic." Liberal Education. Winter 1988.
- Mansbridge, Jane. Beyond Adversary Democracy. New York: Basic Books, 1980.
- Marcuse, Herbert. Essay on Liberation. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1968.
- _____. One Dimensional Man. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1964.
- Markova, A. K. The Teaching and Mastery of Language. London: Croom Helm, 1979.
- Matthews, David. "The Liberal Arts and the Civic Arts." Liberal Education. Winter, 1982.
- Matustik, Martin. "Habermas on Communicative Reason and Performative Contradiction." The Philosophical Forum, Vol. XXI, Nos. 1-2, Fall/Winter. 89-90
- May, William F. "A Public Justification for the Liberal Arts." Winter 1988.
- McCarthy, Thomas. The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1985.
- _____. "A Theory of Communicative Competence." Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Vol. 3, 1973. 135-56.
- McGrath, Earl. General Education and the Plight of Modern Man. Indianapolis: The Lily Endowment, 1976.

- Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Meiklejohn, Alexander. The Experimental College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932.
- Miller, Gary. The Meaning of General Education: The Emergence of a Paradigm. New York: Columbia University, 1988.
- Moore, William, Jr. "The Role of General Education in the Community College." Unpublished paper. Montgomery College, May 22, 1987.
- Morse, Suzanne W. Renewing Civic Capacity: Preparing College Students for Service and Citizenship. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report #8. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University Press, 1989.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1983.
- National Commission for Life Adjustment Education. Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951.
- Newmann, Frank, Catherine Milton, and Susan Stroud. "Community Service and Higher Education: Obligations and Opportunities." AAHE Bulletin. Vol. 37, No. 10, 1985. 9-13.
- Newmann, Frank. Higher Education and the American Resurgence. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985.
- Newmann, Fred M. Education for Citizen Action: Challenge for Secondary Curriculum. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.
- Newmann, John Henry Cardinal. The Idea of a University. Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1959.
- Noddings, Nell. Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984.
- Noll, James W., and Sam P. Kelly. Foundations of Education in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Nussbaum, Martha. "Undemocratic Vistas." New York Review of Books. Vol. XXXIV, No. 17, November 5, 1987.
- O'Banion, Terry, and Ruth G. Shaw. "Obstacles to General Education." B. Lamar Johnson Ed. General Education in Two-Year Colleges. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

- O'Brien, William. "General Education for Technical Students." William Ogilvie and Max Raines Eds. Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1971.
- Ogilvie, William K., and Max R. Raines Eds. Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1971.
- Oliver, Donald and James Shaver. Teaching Public Issues in the High Schools. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin, 1966.
- Parnell, Dale. The Community, Technical and Junior College Times. Vol. II, No. 15, July 17, 1990. 2
- Pateman, Carol. Participation and Democratic Theory. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Paul, Richard. Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World. Sonoma, CA: Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, 1990.
- Phenix, Phillip. Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Pocock, J. G. A. The Macchiavellian Moment: Florentine Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Popkewitz, Thomas S. "Knowledge, Power, and a General Curriculum." Ian Westbury and Alan C. Purves Eds. Cultural Literacy and the Idea of General Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Pratte, Richard. The Civic Imperative: Examining the Need for Civic Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
- President's Commission for Higher Education. Higher Education for Democracy. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947.
- Rasmussen, David M. "Communicative Action and Philosophy: Reflections on Habermas's Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns." Philosophy and Social Criticism. Vol. 9, 1982. 2-28.
- Ravitch, Diane. The Troubled Crusade. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Ravitch, Diane and Chester Finn Jr. What Do Our Seventeen-Year-Olds Know? A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.
- Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

- _____. "Justice as Fairness: Political Not Metaphysical." Philosophy and Public Affairs. Vol. 14, No. 3, Summer 1985. 223-52.
- _____. "Kantian Constructivism in Moral Theory." Journal of Philosophy. Vol. 77, No. 9, September 1980.
- _____. "The Idea of an Overlapping Consensus." Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. Vol. 7, 1987.
- _____. "The Priority of Right and Ideas of the Good." Philosophy and Public Affairs. Vol. 17, No. 4, Fall 1988. 273-4.
- _____. Report on the Core Curriculum. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1979.
- Resnick Parr, Susan. "Skills in a Vacuum." Antioch Review. 433-444.
- Reynolds, James W. "The Adequacy of the General Education Programs of Local Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1944.
- Robinson, James. Promising Practices in Civic Education. Washington, D.C.: NCSS Bulletin, 1967.
- Roderick, Rick. Habermas and the Foundation of Critical Theory. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.
- Roelofs, Mark. The Tension of Citizenship: Private Man and Public Duty. New York: Rinehard, 1957.
- Rothblatt, Sheldon. "General Education on the American Campus: A Historical Introduction in Brief," in Ian Westbury and Alan Purves eds., Cultural Literacy and the Idea of General Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1988.
- Rorty, Richard. Consequences of Pragmatism. Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota, 1982.
- _____. "Education Without Dogma: Truth, Freedom, and Our Universities." Dissent. Spring, 1984.
- _____. Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Rudolph, Frederick. Curriculum. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Sandel, Michael N. Liberalism and the Limits of Justice. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Schlegel, J. Luis. "I.D.S.: Interdisciplinary Studies in General Education--A Program for the 80's." ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges.

- Schumpeter, Joseph. Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
- Select Committee on Education. Education at Berkeley: The Muscatine Report. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1968.
- Shaver, James P. Building Rationales in Citizenship Education. Arlington, VA: NCSS Bulletin, 1977.
- _____. Teaching Public Issues in High Schools. Boston, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin, 1966.
- Skinner, Quentin, Ed. The Return of Grand Theory to the Human Sciences. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Snedden, David. "Progress Toward Sociologically Based Civic Education." Journal of Educational Sociology. Vol. 3, 1929.
- Spanos, William V. The Postmodern Occasion in Literature and Culture. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University, 1987.
- Stanley, Manfred. The Technological Conscience: Survival and Dignity in an Age of Expertise. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- _____. "The Rhetoric of the Commons: Forum Discourse in Politics and Society." Syracuse University Center for the Study for Citizenship, Center Paper Number 7. April 1987.
- Steiner, George. "Little Red Schoolhouse." The New Yorker. V. 63, No. 15. June 1, 1987. 107.
- Strike, Kenneth. Educational Policy and the Just Society. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1982.
- _____. Liberal Justice and the Marxist Critique of Education. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- _____. Liberty and Learning. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.
- _____. "The Moral Role of Schooling in a Liberal Democratic Society."
- Students for a Democratic Society. The Port Huron Statement. Chicago, IL: SDS, 1966.
- Sullivan, Eugene J., and Penelope W. Suritz. General Education and Associate Degrees: A National Study. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1978.
- Sullivan, William. Reconstructing Public Philosophy. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1982.

- Taylor, Charles. "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man." Interpretive Social Sciences: A Reader. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979.
- Tesconi, Charles. Schooling in America: A Social Philosophical Perspective. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin, 1975.
- Thomas, Russell. The Search for a Common Learning: General Education 1800-1960. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Thornton, James W. Jr. The Community Junior College. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- deTocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America, Vol. I. New York: Vintage Press, 1954.
- Tussman, Joseph. "Remembering Alexander Meiklejohn." Liberal Education. Vol. 70, No. 4. Winter 1984. 323-42.
- _____. Experiment at Berkeley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Undergraduate General Education and the Humanities Requirement. Higher Education Surveys. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation, January 1989.
- United States Bureau of Education. Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education Appointed by the National Education Association. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1918.
- United States National Institute of Education Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1984.
- Vaughan, George B. and Associates, Eds. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.
- Wall, Alfred W. "What About Terminal General Education in the Junior College?" Junior College Journal. No. 33, September 1962. 20-24.
- Walzer, Michael. "A Critique of Philosophical Conversation." The Philosophical Forum. Vol. XXI, Nos. 1-2, Fall/Winter 1989-90.
- _____. "Flight From Philosophy." New York Review of Books. February 2, 1989. 42-44.
- _____. Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

- Warnke, Georgia. "Rawls, Habermas and Real Talk: A Reply to Walzer." The Philosophical Forum. Vol. 21, No. 2, Fall, 1990. 1989-1990.
- Weissberg, Robert. Political Learning, Political Choice and Democratic Citizenship. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Westbury, Ian, and Alan Purves Eds. Cultural Literacy and the Idea of General Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Whitehead, Alfred N. The Aims of Education and Other Essays. New York: MacMillan, 1929.
- Wiebe, Robert. The Search for Order, 1877-1980. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.
- Wilson, Bryan. Rationality. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Wolfe, Alan. Books in Review. January-February, 1981.
- Wolin, Sheldon. Politics and Vision, Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought. Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1960.
- _____. "The New Public Philosophy." Democracy. Vol. 1, No. 1, 1980.